

VOLUME XLVIII

April 1953

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

NUMBER 2
APR 23 1953

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

desk

A *Quarterly Journal* devoted to re-
search in the Languages, Literatures,
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

THE UNIVERSITY of CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

RICHARD TREAT BRUÈRE, *Managing Editor*
 BLANCHE BEATRICE BOYER FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON
 OSCAR BRONEER JAKOB A. O. LARSEN
 CARL DARLING BUCK RICHARD P. McKEON
 BENEDICT FINARSON RALPH MARCUS
 GERTRUDE SMITH

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FREDERICK MALCOLM COMBELLACK, *University of Oregon* GERALD F. ELSE, *University of Iowa*
 LLOYD W. DALY, *University of Pennsylvania* WILLIAM CHASE GREENE, *Harvard University*
 AUBREY DILLER, *Indiana University* GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*

VOL. XLVIII CONTENTS FOR APRIL 1953 No. 2

The So-called Prelude to the <i>Carmen saeculare</i>	G. L. Hendrickson	73
Ammianus Marcellinus and the <i>Curia</i> of Antioch	Roger Pack	80
A Thessalian Family under the Principate	J. A. O. Larsen	86
Notes and Discussions		96

PHILIP W. DAMON: A Second Propertius Florilegium.—J. F. GILLIAM: A Roman Naval Roster: *P. Rylands 79*.—JOHN P. COOKE: *Papae!*—PAUL G. MOORHEAD: Correction of a Reference to Philostratus *Vita Apollonii* 3. 16.

Book Reviews 101

GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH: *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Beare).—ROBERT F. GOHEEN: *The Imagery of Sophocles' Antigone* (Blacklock).—BEN EDWIN FERRY: *Aesopica*, I (Clark).—J. MAROUZEAU: *L'Ordre des mots dans la phrase latine*, III (Harsh).—DAVID M. ROBINSON: *Excavations at Olynthus*, Part XIII (Smith).—P. MACKENDRICK and H. M. HOWE (eds.): *Classica in Translation*, I and II (Basset).—R. LATTIMORE (trans.): *The Iliad of Homer* (Combella).—L. FERRERO: *Poetica nuova in Lucrezio* (Stocker).—B. WALKER: *The Annals of Tacitus* (Bruère).—H. RACKHAM (ed. and trans.): *Pliny: Natural History*, Vols. V and IX; W. H. S. JONES (ed. and trans.), Vol. VI (Bruère).—LAURENS J. MILLS (ed. and trans.): *Senilis Amor* (Bruère).—E. H. STURTEVANT and E. ADELAIDE HAHN: *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*, I² (Whatmough).—R. H. ROBINS: *Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory in Europe* (Whatmough).—STEPHEN ULLMANN: *Words and Their Use* (Whatmough).—A. ERNOUT and A. MEILLET: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, II² (Whatmough).—EINAR LÖFSTEDT: *Coniectanea*, I (Whatmough).—D. DRINGER: *The Alphabet* (Whatmough).—H. GRÉGOIRE and L. MÉRIDIER (eds. and trans.): *Euripide*, V (Helmbold).—D. M. ROBATHAN: *The Monuments of Ancient Rome* (Evans).—MARTIN P. NILSSON: *Opuscula selecta*, I (Nock).—H. M. HUBBELL (ed. and trans.): *Cicero: De inventione; De optimo genere oratorum; Topica* (Caplan).—A. ROSTAGNI: *Storia della letteratura latina*, II (Pease).—R. PÉPIN (ed. and trans.): *Quintus Sertorius: Liber medicinalis* (Veith).—G. WALSER: *Rom, das Reich und die fremden Völker in der Geschichtsschreibung der frühen Kaiserzeit* (Haywood).—M. E. MILHAM: *A Glossarial Index to De re coquinaria of Apicius* (Pickel).—E. LOBEL, C. H. ROBERTS, E. P. WEGENER (eds. and trans.): *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part XVII (Schuman).—M. POHLENZ: *Gestalten aus Hellas* (Robinson).—MICHAEL GRANT: *Ancient History* (Roebuck).—S. and A. ABDUL-HAK: *Catalogue illustré du Département des Antiquités gréco-romaines au Musée de Damas* (Walton).

Books Received 143

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor of Classical Philology, Box I, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill. All manuscripts must be typed, double spaced—both texts and notes—with ample margins on firm paper (not onion-skin, etc.).

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Ave., Chicago 37, Illinois. ¶ Subscriptions are by volume only. The subscription price is \$6.00 per volume; the price of single issues is \$1.75. Orders for service of less than a full volume will be charged at the single issue rate. ¶ Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States and its possessions. No extra charge for countries in the Pan American Postal Union. ¶ Postage is charged extra as follows: for Canada and Newfoundland, 20 cents per volume (total \$6.20), 5 cents per issue (total \$1.80); for all other countries in the Postal Union, 50 cents per volume (total \$6.50), 10 cents per issue (total \$1.85). ¶ Subscriptions are payable in advance. Please make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following is an authorized agent:

For the British Empire except North America and Australasia: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1, England. Prices of subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application. Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Ill. Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Microfilms of this journal are available to regular subscribers only and may be obtained at the end of the volume year. Orders and inquiries should be addressed to University Microfilms, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Notice to subscribers: If you change your address, please notify us and your local postmaster immediately. Entered as second-class matter June 20, 1906, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in United States Postal Act of October 3, 1917, Section 1103, amended February 28, 1925, authorized June 6, 1918.

7

tu

2

3

0

6

6

1

3

e

i

h

h

h

h

h

h

h

h

h



C
I

7

.
C
n
in
ti
a
s
b
a
p
w
st
su
o
o
s
cl

it
v
tr
as
gi
a
di
ri
th

ica

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XLVIII

APRIL 1953

Number 2

THE SO-CALLED PRELUDE TO THE *CARMEN SAECULARE**

G. L. HENDRICKSON

I

THE sixth ode of Horace's fourth book claims a special interest because of its close relation to the *Carmen saeculare*, to which it is commonly designated as the prelude. Such indeed it is, or may be so called if the time of its composition be taken literally as essentially coincident with the scene which it represents, falling just before the great festival itself. Over against this literal understanding of our poem the question is here raised, whether it is not rather a fanciful construction of such a scene, placed at such a time, but is in fact of later origin, composed to afford the poet opportunity to record the festival itself, his own participation in it, and to claim as his own the anonymous hymn.

As for the scene, whether we place its composition before or after the festival, it is a brief dramatic episode introduced by the long prayer of the poet as director of the chorus of boys and girls, whose presence is only revealed after the conclusion of the prayer by direct address — *virginum primae puerique* (vs. 31). Though no allusion to them is made before this, yet the main

content of the prayer and its specific plea to the god both imply their presence. Beginning with a single word of address to the god the prayer reaches over seven unbroken stanzas to its conclusion, which invokes his aid to lend glory and success to the song of the Daunian Muse: *Dive . . . Dauniae defende decus Camenae*. The chorus of high-born boys and girls are but children, yet upon them rests the crowning expression of the religious meaning of the festival. The prayer is not thus merely a formal invocation of the god, but a specific plea for his help — *defende decus*, implying what it would have been ill-omened to express, *defende contra dedecus*, imperfection or failure. It betrays the poet's concern for the task before him and his chorus.

Turning back to the beginning of the prayer, the attribute of Apollo as avenger of arrogant pride and boastfulness (*magnae vindicem linguae*) owes its elaborate development to the presence of the chorus, to impress upon their youthful minds the religious significance of their role, and a realization that but for the intervention of Apollo there would have been no Rome and no secular festival to celebrate. Aeneas and

* *Aus der Festschrift für Max Pohlenz zum 80. Geburtstag am 30. Juli 1952.*

his little band would have shared the utter annihilation with which Achilles threatened Troy and all its people, even to the babe — *latentem matris in alvo*. The myth thus vividly presented furnishes the background for two stanzas of the *Carmen saeculare* (vss. 37–44) which recount the heroic escape of Aeneas from burning Troy, an unwilling survivor of his fatherland, yet destined for a future greater than the past — *daturus plura relictis*. In our poem the same thought is carried back to its divine prophecy, when at the intercession of Apollo and Venus the father of gods grants to Aeneas and his train walls drawn with better omen — *potiore ductos alite muros*. With these words the myth of Apollo's place in the founding of Rome comes to an end. Contrasting with its length, the attribute of the god as teacher and leader of the Muses merges in a single stanza with the concluding plea for the god's help, toward which the whole prayer is directed.

There follow now two verses spoken as if in reply to some unspoken challenge of the poet's approach to the god:

spiritum Phoebus mihi, Phoebus artem
carminis nomenque dedit poetae.

The words, though motivated by the conclusion of the prayer just uttered, have a wider significance and contemplate his whole life as a poet lived in the face of malevolent disparagement. They are the counterpart to the avowal at the end of the companion piece to our poem, the third of book four, of his indebtedness to the Muse for what he has become: *totum muneris hoc tui est*, etc.

Now at length after the long distraction of the prayer and the two appended verses, the poet addresses his youthful chorus. The dramatic obscurity of the opening scene is resolved by this address, and the significance of the Apollo

myth becomes clear with recognition of the ears to which it was spoken. The essential message which the poet has now to convey to his chorus is brief but important, a practical admonition for the morrow's performance, to heed carefully the rhythmical beats of his directing hand. It is the human obverse of the prayer for divine help in making the production of their hymn successful (*defende decus*). The whole address hinges upon the imperative *servate pedem*, to which are attached modifying words constituting a decorative description of the *Carmen saeculare* in its essential features: the character of the chorus of boys and girls (*claris patribus orti*), under the protection of Diana (*tutela deae*), singing in Lesbian measure the son of Leto, and Diana Noctiluca, prospering the fruits of earth as the seasons return. To the chorus, to whom these words are addressed, they convey only what to them was familiar knowledge, but to the future reader of the poet's book, who may or may not know the *Carmen saeculare*, they will yield a clear picture of the festival, of the participation of poet and chorus, and the theme and form of their song.

The last stanza (*nupta¹ iam dices*) with happy conceit, suggestive of intimacy and affection, places in the mouth of the youthful chorus a reflection of after years on their share in the sacred rite concluding with the name of the poet. As in the companion piece to our poem, *quem tu Melpomene* (4. 3.), Horace thanks the Muse for the recognition he has won against jealous carping tongues, so here without bitterness but with the same pride he records his authorship of the *Carmen saeculare*, modestly, as if spoken not by himself but by another — *reddidi carmen vatis Horati*. His name thus at the end

stands in bold vindication of that name² which had been the open badge of servile origins and the vehicle of malicious taunts — *libertino patre natus*.

The question of why the *Carmen saeculare*, the proudest it would seem of his odes, was not included in the succeeding fourth book of *Odes* seems to have engaged the attention of few editors and critics. At the moment I can only cite Heinze's brief remark, that as a choral *Kultlied* it was excluded. That seems by no means a satisfactory explanation, since apart from other religious hymns among the *Odes*, the twenty-first of the first book is a *Kultlied* of the same type as the *Carmen saeculare*, and may well have been composed for some ceremony of which we lack the record. However, if the *Carmen saeculare* was withheld from the fourth book for the reason assigned, the principle of exclusion would seem to have been the traditional presumption of anonymity³ in such hymns, as containing not the words of a specific poet, but the common prayer of the people, as priestly usage and tradition had formulated it. The official *acta* might record the name of such a poet, as Livius Andronicus for the year 207 B.C., or Licinius Tegula for 200, just as they do in fact record Q. Horatius Flaccus for the year 17. But the *Carmen saeculare* itself is an anonymous *Kultlied*, and for the author to claim it for his own and place it among his works may have seemed an act of impiety, or at least unfitting, after so brief an interval since its public performance.

If such considerations account for its absence from the fourth book of *Odes*, which appeared some four or five years later, the poet might still entertain doubt whether it would ever find a place among his work. At his death it is certain that it had found no such

place. In brief I venture to raise the question, as said above, whether in fact our poem is a true prelude to the *Carmen saeculare*, or not rather a retrospective imaginative scene owing its origin to the very absence of the poem which it describes and interprets. In this fanciful conception of a final meeting with the chorus, or rehearsal, on the eve of the great day, the poet finds opportunity to make amends for the absence of the hymn, which we must presume he would gladly have included. Yet the two poems could scarcely have stood side by side in the same small collection. Reasons of repetition and tautology would have excluded the one or the other. But since it was for whatever reason the *Carmen saeculare* which was not or could not be admitted, whether or not it should escape oblivion, upon its perhaps unwilling substitute he bestowed pains to make it a record of all that the secular hymn and its performance had meant for his pride and his life as a poet, and to stamp it as his own. That our poem is of later origin cannot obviously be demonstrated, but there are I think indications which may justify one's feeling that it is. Just as in its companion piece, *quem tu Melpomene*, there is a tone of confidence, almost of arrogance, as of one looking back upon a great role successfully played, so here too there is confidence arising from accomplishment. He can now after the event claim honor in his own name. Another clue to later origin is found in the close of our poem. The *Carmen saeculare* concluded with the confident assurance of the chorus that the gods have heard their prayer. It is upon this pledge that in our poem the hymn is characterized as *carmen dis amicum*, an epithet which could have significance only after the *Carmen saeculare* had been sung.

II

HORACE AND PINDAR

The death of Achilles at the hand of Apollo, and its significance for the founding of Rome occupy six of the seven stanzas of the opening prayer of our poem. While Horace has made the theme his own by vigor and fullness of treatment, yet in origin it is an adaptation of part of a paean of Pindar, first published by Grenfell in 1908 from a badly broken edition of the paeans.⁴ In the fragmentary text of the sixth, the myth of Apollo's relation to Troy is developed, and his efforts to save the beleaguered city against the hostile labors of Hera and Athene, but most of all against the might of Achilles. His wanton cruelty and boastfulness the god, in the mortal form of Paris, checked with a fatal arrow. Though not thereby saving the doomed city (which fate forbade), yet he put off to a later time its capture, confounding by this bold and bloody act the might of Thetis' son, the trusted rampart of the Achaeans. "What strife he waged with Hera! what strife with Athene! Yet for all their great labors, he (Achilles) would have ravaged the Dardan city if Apollo had not stood guard over it": ὅσα τ' ἔριξε λευκωλένω / ... Ἡρα ... / ὅσα τε Πολιάδι· πρὸ πόνων / δέ κε μεγάλων Δαρδανίαν / ἔπραθεν, εἰ μὴ φύλασσαν Ἀπόλλω". Since this last phrase stands closest to Pindar in Horace's adaptation, a word of explanation may be added. Hera and Athene Polias, divine allies of the Grecian host, are working to the same end as Achilles. With them, a god against goddesses, Apollo has striven, but their efforts though great were of no avail. They are named as part of the myth, but they form here a background of failure, against which to magnify the might of

Achilles. *He* would have succeeded but for death at the hands of the god. In the text as edited scholars have generally accepted Bury's change of ἔπραθεν (which implies Achilles as subject) to ἔπραθον, a change which confuses feebly the heroic role of success with the unsuccessful efforts of the goddesses. It dilutes Achilles' part to one of participation, where it is meant to stand alone. For the omission of the subject with ἔπραθεν, the compelling antithesis of the whole context is reason enough.

Turning now to Horace, he elaborates far beyond Pindar, and more effectively, what Achilles would have done (*Dardanas turris quateret*) but for the staying hand of Apollo. (If he had survived) he would not have stooped to the cowardly deceit of the wooden horse (*non inclusus equo ... falleret*), but openly would have destroyed the captive people by fire and sword, even down to unborn babes (*sed palam captis ... ureret*). In contrast with these intense, vehement apodoses in Horace (*quateret, ureret*), stands in Pindar the simple *κε ... ἔπραθεν*, followed by the conditional *εἰ μὴ φύλασσαν*. Even into the condition, upon which the Horatian apodoses rest, Horace has followed his model with *ni ... divom pater adnuisset*⁵. Horace found the presence of the two goddesses of Pindar's story irrelevant to his single purpose centered upon Achilles. But there may be nevertheless a shadowy suggestion of them left, when at the beginning of the second stanza he characterizes Achilles with the words: *ceteris maior, tibi miles impar*, "greater than all others," even than the goddesses Hera and Athene, as he may have meant to suggest.

III

Pollicis ictum

From these considerations of the nature and purpose of our ode, and of its indebtedness to Pindar, we turn now to a minor problem of interpretation.

Lesbium servate pedem meique
pollicis ictum.

The language is matter of fact and literal, just such an admonition as any anxious choral director might employ at a final rehearsal before the public performance. The modern reader may feel some strangeness in the designation of the thumb as the baton instrument — a strangeness provoked by English translations such as Wickham's "to the time of my thumb," or Maclean's "by the motion of my thumb," where one asks: "What motion?" Godley dodges the question by rendering *pollicis* as "finger" which is more readily understood. But the thumb? — that member which in our usage is the symbol of awkwardness. Porphyrio's comment does not touch the problem directly, but by his *quasi ipse lyram percutiat* it may be inferred that he thinks of the thumb as stroking the strings of the lyre. The silence of most commentators seems to imply that this is the commonly accepted, and perhaps the satisfactory meaning. However one may still entertain doubt whether this explains adequately the poet's words, which seem to imply something more emphatic and visible before a large chorus of amateurs.

A clue to another and perhaps more natural explanation is furnished by the second- or third-century metrical Terentianus Maurus at verse 2257 of his long versified treatise. In citing the reason for pronouncing the iambic trimeter by dipodies, since only at the even places the pure iambus is found,

it is there he says that in scanning the line the ictus or mora must be placed,

quam pollicis sonore vel plausu pedis
discriminare qui docent artem solent.

What audible sound the thumb is capable of making is described with ingenious precision by Ovid (*Fasti* 5.433), *signaque dat digitis medio cum pollice iunctis*, "a snap of the fingers." This then is the *pollicis sonore* which Terentianus offers as alternative to a tap of the foot. Note also that he speaks of it as the common practice of teachers. May this then be the *pollicis ictum* of Horace? It is untimely at this point to insist, but let us look about and see how accurately these words describe a snap of the fingers, and its suitability for beating time. Modern interpreters would doubtless shrink from accepting so trivial and vulgar a gesture as the poet's meaning, but a humble member of their guild at some time in later antiquity did not, and he in turn may well have trodden in the footprints of earlier interpreters. I refer to one of the anonymous commentators who emerges sometimes helpfully from the chaotic ps-Acronian scholia. If he has escaped observation hitherto in relation to our passage it is because he is hidden away at verse 274 of the *Ars poetica*: "Our fathers praised the wit and the numbers of Plautus, too tolerant of both, not to say stupid,"

si modo ego et vos

...
legitimumque sonum digitis calle-
mus et aure.

The scholium on this passage is not a unit and has apparently been made up from more than one source: "*Digitis*" *pro arte rithmica et numeris* (where *numeris* merely translates *rithmica*), indicating that the fingers are employed for marking the rhythm, but without exact specification of the manner. This

is followed by way of illustration with citation of our passage, *Lesbium servate pedem*, etc., which furnishes *pollicis* as corresponding to *digitis*. Then with repetition: "*digitis*" et "*aure*" quia sonus metri "*pollicis strepitu*" et *auris perceptione probari solet*. Here in view of the citation of our passage from 4. 6 it appears that *pollicis strepitu* is an interpretation of *pollicis ictum*, and of *digitis* as well, in the *Ars poetica*. That is, in both places the rhythm is thought of as marked by a snap of the fingers. This conclusion is confirmed by Porphyrio, whose corrupt text (at *A. p.* 274) *cum metra digitis abaura serimus* has been skillfully emended to *digitis ob aures ferimus probantes an consonent*, that is "we strike (snap) with the fingers to help the ear in determining whether the verse is harmonious." Here also, as in Terentianus, ps-Acro speaks of this usage as a common practice for testing the correctness of the verse, just as Horace himself speaks of testing the uncouth verses of Plautus *digitis et aure*.

With our scholiast we are dealing with an uncertain author of uncertain time, yet his interpretation agrees with the general statement of Terentianus sufficiently to let us believe that he speaks of a familiar ancient usage, at least of the schools. With Quintilian we rise to a higher level and an earlier time. In his general treatment of "composition" in 9. 4, he distinguishes carefully (at 53f.) between the rhythm of verse and of prose. In verse, observance of strict rhythm goes so far that unsounded intervals of time are measured by beats of the foot or the fingers (*et pedum et digitorum ictu*). But any such precision is alien to prose, in which regularity of arsis and thesis would be intolerable: *oratio non descendet ad crepitem digitorum et pedum* ("prose will not stoop to the fetters of snapping

fingers and tapping feet"). To be sure Quintilian is not commenting on Horace, but whether or not we shall accept this meaning as the poet's intention in *pollicis ictum*, the evidence suffices to show that this method of marking time was a familiar school practice in scanning verse.

But lest anyone should be skeptical of my rendering of *pollicis sonore*, *pollicis strepitus* and *digitorum crepitus* (*strepitus*), a glance at some other uses of the same phrase will make it plain that the normal educated Roman reader must have understood the words in Quintilian, and in the other sources cited, of snapping the fingers. The action or gesture was familiar to everyone, though its application to marking time for verse or song may not have been. However the most widely used form of the phrase, *digitis crepare* (*concrepare*), *digitorum crepitus* (*strepitus*), has only this meaning. It is varied by the introduction of the thumb, as in the examples already cited, and in Ovid's precise description, or when Martial employs *arguto pollice* (the expressive, persuasive thumb) as identical in meaning with *digiti crepantis* as a master's summons to a slave to fetch the *matella*. Cicero affords the variant *digitorum percussione* of a snap of the finger as a gesture of something utterly worthless (as we use the phrase today). Of impatient command (as in Martial) Jerome (*Ep.* 125. 18) describes one Grumius: *adducto supercilio contractis naribus ac fronte rugata duobus digitulis concrepabat, hoc signo ad audiendum discipulos provocans*. Again Velius Longus (*GLK*, VII, 47) to illustrate that unwritten language has meaning: *nam et digitorum sono pueros ad respondendum ciemus*. From this brief survey it appears that Quintilian's phrase can have had no other meaning, and since

he uses it without remark it must have been a customary usage in his time as well as in the time of Terentianus or of our scholiast. It would follow therefore that our Horatian phrase, occurring in the same context, should naturally have the same meaning and be so understood, as the scholiast in fact understood both *pollicis ictum* here and *digitis* in the *Ars poetica*.

The objection that Horace cannot be thought of as using so trivial a gesture, whether as trainer or as actual director of the public performance need not weigh too heavily. An action or gesture which seems to us trivial and undignified may easily have passed from schoolroom use to the director's podium. It calls for nothing awkward or unbecoming in physical posture, merely adding a moment of sound to the down-beat of hand and forearm. The further objection of noise accompanying the beating of time weighed much less with either Greeks or Romans, who were familiar with the *scabellum* or foot-clapper, and other noisy accompaniments. In 207 B.C., during the darkest days of Hannibal's invasion, a *novemdiale sacrum* was proclaimed in view of an unusual series of alarming prodigies. The pontifices decreed that twenty-seven virgins should march through the city singing with appropriate dance movements a song of expiation to Juno Regina. The author of the song was Livius Andronicus, first name in formal

literature at Rome. His song was doubtless composed in saturnians, which the historian Livy in telling the story found too crude to impose upon the ears of his readers. Its rhythm too, like the *Carmen saeculare*, was marked, as the virgins *sonum vocis pulsu pedum modulantes incesserunt*.

For the time and situation it is reasonable to assume that Livius was at once composer, trainer, and director of the chorus. In our poem Horace by the use of "*mei pollicis*" implies that he would himself be director of the public performance. Commentators speak of a professional χοροδιδάσκαλος as more probable. But was it not rather the mark of the whole ceremony that it was performed throughout by the proper actors themselves as authentic representatives of the Roman people each in his station? Augustus and Agrippa perform sacrifices, Roman matrons offer their prayer to Juno and to Ilithyia, the chorus is sung by the purest offspring of Roman parents, not by hired singers. And was it not perhaps a main source of Horace's pride and triumph that he, a freedman's son, had won a place on the Capitol and in the temple of Apollo as an equal participant with the greatest of Rome, exercising his ancient right of poet, trainer, and director?

YALE UNIVERSITY

NOTES

1. It is tempting to refer *nupta* to the whole chorus of boys and girls, in agreement with *tutela* (*deae*), and not to the girls alone. "*Nubere veteres non solum mulieres, sed etiam viros dicebant; ita ut nunc Itali dicunt*" (Nonius 143 M., Lindsay, I, 208). The same usage recurs as early as Tertullian.

2. On the gentile name *Horatius*, assumed by freedmen upon emancipation in the rustic *tribus Horatia*, to which *Venusia* belonged, see Münzer in *RE*, 2321-22 s. v. "*Horatius*".

3. On the anonymous character of *Kullieder* such as the *Carm. saec.* see the observations of Norden, *Aus altrom. Priesterbüchern*, pp. 274-75 and note.

4. For the relevant passages of the Pindaric paean see Sandys, *Pindar* p. 538, ll. 75-91, Schroeder⁴, p. 285. My friend Hubbell calls my attention to *Iliad* 18. 454, *κεν... ἐπρόσθον εἰ μὴ Ἀπόλλων*, etc., referring to the death of Patroclus, which seems to be echoed in the passage of the paean discussed here.

5. Lucian Müller in his edition of the *Odes* was so offended with *ni* in lyric poetry that he deleted the whole stanza, and with it the significance of Apollo's slaying of Achilles for the founding of Rome. Unfortunate that he could not or did not know Pindar's vindication of the offending *ni* in *εἰ μὴ φύλασεν Ἀπόλλων*.

AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS AND THE *CURIA* OF ANTIOCH

ROGER PACK

IN A fairly recent study E. A. Thompson analyzed Ammianus' methods and attitudes, observing that in all likelihood the historian was born into the hereditary order of *curiales*, or municipal senators, in his native city of Antioch, and that his few prejudices may perhaps be ascribed to this cause.¹ In fact, Thompson is inclined to accept Ensslin's suggestion that Ammianus was actually threatened with conscription for curial service during the reign of Julian.² The problem is intriguing, and even though it will probably never admit of a final solution, I should like to call attention to a neglected source which may be properly drawn into the orbit of conjecture. For, once inaugurated, a promising line of speculation normally passes through two more stages: all of the pertinent data are brought to bear upon it, and then the assumptions are castigated and, if necessary, revised. Most of my remarks belong to the second of these phases, but the third of course represents an equally imperative duty.

Let us first examine the three texts which Ensslin cited in support of his inference:

Nec privatorum utilitates in tempore ita flagranti despiciens [sc. Julianus], litesque audiens controversas maxime municipalium ordinum, ad quorum favorem propensior, iniuste plures muneribus publicis adnectebat (Amm. 21. 12. 23).

Sed ut haec laudanda... ita illud amarum et notabile fuit, quod aegre sub eo a curialibus quisquam adpetitus, licet privilegiis et stipendiorum numero et originis penitus alienae firmitudine communitus, ius obtinebat aequissimum, adeo

ut perique territi emercarentur molestias pretiis clandestinis... (22. 9. 12).

Illud quoque [sc. beside his forbidding Christians to give rhetorical instruction] itidem parum ferendum, quod municipalium ordinum coetibus patiebatur iniuste quosdam adnecti vel peregrinos vel ab his consortiis privilegiis aut origine longe discretos (25. 4. 21).

The first passage, according to its position in the narrative, refers particularly to Julian's activity in A.D. 361, when he was at Naïssus in Moesia, and the second relates to his sojourn in Ancyra during the following year, while en route to Antioch.³ But the application of Ammianus' complaint clearly extends beyond the immediate circumstances of time and place, because the words *aegre sub eo . . . ius obtinebat* express a generalization such as recurs in the final summary of Julian's life and character (25. 4. 21). We are told that Julian's motive in enrolling new *curiales* was to ingratiate himself with the old members (*ad quorum favorem propensior . . .*), but it was rather one of the incidentally benevolent aims of his policy to ease the burdens of the old members by providing that they should be more widely distributed. It is noteworthy that here the historian's sympathies lie with the potential conscripts to the *curia* and not with the *curiales* themselves, as in his report of the quarrel between Julian and the *curia* (22. 14. 1-2). In other words, when the question of recruitment comes up, his loyalties shift in a way which suggests that he had a personal interest in the matter, or even

that he may have been an unwilling conscript himself.

The law upon which he would presumably have relied in resisting conscription is *Cod. Theod.* 12. 1. 38, of A.D. 346, providing that all of those who had joined the *protectores domestici* and certain other units in an attempt to evade their curial duties were to be recalled to their *curiae* unless they had completed five years of military service (*si necdum quinque stipendia compleverunt . . .*).⁴ Ammianus was qualified for the exemption granted by this clause, as he had served from his youth in the elite corps of the *protectores* and describes his service from 353 to 359, when Ursicinus, his superior officer, was relieved of his command as *magister equitum*.⁵ The phrase *licet . . . stipendiorum numero . . . communitus* (22. 9. 12) must then allude either covertly to himself or more objectively to others who could defend their exemption on these or similar grounds.

On the other hand, the enactment of Julian to which the *curia* may have appealed in claiming his services cannot be quite so readily determined.⁶ *Cod. Theod.* 12. 1. 52, dated from Antioch on September 3, 362, has some interest here, because it conscripted for the *curia* of a given municipality those *curiales* of other cities who had established residence (*incolatus*) in it, apart from the mere owning of land in the vicinity. These are evidently the *peregrini* mentioned by Ammianus (25. 4. 21), but of course he, a native of Antioch, can hardly have belonged to their number. Baehrens (see note 2) believed that his indignation was directed chiefly at the treatment of these *peregrini*, to whose plight he refers in terms that tend to conceal the supposed allusion to his own, but I think that even if such is the emphasis it need not

trouble us, as a good historian would hardly be so artless as to dwell upon his personal difficulties, though he might feel tempted to hint at them. *Cod. Theod.* 12. 1. 51, dated from Antioch on August 28, 362, conscripted in that city, at least, even those who stemmed from a curial family only on the mother's side (cf. Zosimus 3. 11). Whether this applied to Ammianus we do not know, but it is immaterial, because the clear implication is that those of curial descent on the father's side could be drafted without the need of new legislation.⁷ All in all, it is my impression that if any persistent claim was made upon him it was of dubious legality, but that a colorable pretext for an initial claim could have been easily discovered.

There are two indications that the *curia* exceeded the intent of the law when it undertook to enroll new members. In the first place, *Cod. Theod.* 12. 1. 53, dated at Antioch on September 18, 362, and addressed to Salustius, the *praefectus praetorio*, stated that all additions made to the *curia* since September first were to be invalidated, except for the clearly legitimate cases of sons of *curiales* and persons of the lowest class who possessed the amount of property which obligated them to service.⁸ The prefect was to examine the cases predating September first. Secondly, Julian himself complained that he had given the *curiales* an opportunity to conscript some of his wealthiest treasury officials and mint-masters, but that instead they had subjected a certain individual to the performance of a liturgy even before his name was placed on the register and while his case was still pending. Again, they had dragged in a poor man from the market place and made him a *curialis*.⁹ We infer from the dates

that the legislation was energetically or even extravagantly enforced soon after it had been promulgated in the autumn of 362; and when we identify the individuals who were most active in enforcing it we shall find that their work, seemingly little hampered by Julian's expressed scruples — or, should we say, even encouraged by his hint that some of his own officials would have been fair game — extended well into the next year, even after the emperor had left on his Persian expedition.

Now we do not know who was governor of Syria in 362,¹⁰ but just before his departure for the East, on March 5, 363 (Amm. 23. 2. 6), Julian appointed Alexander of Heliopolis, a man whose harsh nature, we are told, was thought well calculated to hold the greedy and slanderous Antiochenes in check. Ammianus characterizes him in strongly adverse terms,¹¹ but not with a readily demonstrable bias. Libanius writes to Julian that at first he disapproved of Alexander's regime, partly because of the heavy tax which the governor levied upon the city, but that he is ready to "sing a palinode" now that the fruits of this severe policy have been garnered. The sophist gives us a vivid picture of the Spartan discipline that Alexander imposed upon the Antiochenes.¹² Another letter shows that there was a special reason for this real or professed change of heart, namely, that Alexander had driven many students to Libanius' school at the expense of rival rhetors (*Ep.* 838 [758 W]). The governor was urged, when planning one of his official tours, not to alarm the residents of Apamea with loud threats, but to try a more tactful approach (*Ep.* 1351 [1053 W]), and his visit is said to have been a great success because he took this advice to heart; for his visit to Tarsus in Cilicia,

over which he exercised a supervisory control, he needed no such admonitions because its people were more tractable (*Ep.* 1392 [1450 W]). Ammianus' verdict on Alexander affords a partial contrast to all of this; whether it is merely honest and forthright, uninfluenced by any personal considerations, or whether the phrasing reflects some disagreeable contact with the governor is of course a matter of opinion, but any friction would most probably have resulted from an attempt on the governor's part to enroll him among the *curiales*.

We have two letters of Libanius which were written to Alexander in the interest of the *curiales* Auxentius of Tarsus and Gerontius of Apamea, two of the cities included in his tour,¹³ but in Antioch the governor appears to have delegated much of the conscription of new *curiales* to a prominent member of the *curia* itself. This was a certain Letoïus,¹⁴ whose success in this undertaking was so conspicuous that Libanius recalled it with praise about a quarter of a century later in his companion addresses *Ad senatum Antiochenum* and *Ad Theodosium pro curiis* (*Or.* 48–49). The two passages, which parallel and supplement each other, bring us to the main point of our argument. "Do you not see what fine things Letoïus often tells about himself — (the cases of) Macrentius, Maternus, Julianus, and many others — and his struggles for these men against the generals? He thought that these contests were creditable in spite of the penalties they involved (*Or.* 48. 42)." "When our friend Letoïus was a *curialis* (and one might say that he is even now in the person of his son), did he not restore three fugitives to the *curia*, men who had led companies, commanded soldiers, and with them traveled over much of the world in

obedience to the crises that summoned them? And yet in doing this he knew he would arouse the enmity of a general who was the slave of a hot temper and full of impetuosity." The writer goes on to tell how the general, toasting Letoïus' health at a dinner party, demanded his signature to a document (no doubt a release from curial service) which he had coerced all the other *curiales* into signing. But Letoïus refused, and suffered no harm beyond the enduring hatred of his petitioner (*Or.* 49. 19).

If the three fugitives whose conscription represented his sole or greatest triumph were indeed Macrentius, Maternus, and Julianus, these would appear to have been Antiochenes or *peregrini* and army officers with curial ties.¹⁵ We note that there were "many others" whom he tried at least to conscript, a category which may well have included Ammianus, though it is probably no more than a coincidence that the allusion to the frequent transfer of such officers to widely distant posts of duty would so neatly describe his earlier career, which had carried him, with Ursicinus, to such remote cities as Milan, Cologne, Rheims, and Sirmium. Of greatest interest is the fact that Letoïus' recruiting activities were largely directed against ranking military personnel, and that he met with sharp resistance from the highest echelons. The situation is not difficult to understand. Julian's expansion of the *curiae* had come just at the time when the preparations for his campaign had led to the concentration in Antioch of units which doubtless included a certain number of native Antiochenes and *peregrini* against whom the *curia* could conveniently assert its authority so long as they were quartered in the city.¹⁶

We learn a little more about Letoïus' inquisitions from a letter (*Ep.* 1365 [1427 W]) sent by Libanius to the *comes Orientis* Aradius Rufinus, who had crossed the Euphrates in order to be near the army (*Ep.* 1398. 5, 1400. 7 [1183, 1217W]). The writer apologizes for Letoïus' extreme devotion to his task, attributing it to his obedience to the governor, his patriotism, and his innate detestation of wrong-doing. He has been going about baying like a hound, yet there are many wolves, and a fierce watch-dog is needed. He has brought some cases into court and has even incriminated a member of Rufinus' staff, which has evidently remained at his headquarters in Antioch. Rufinus is asked not to credit the slanders against Letoïus that may reach his ears from the culprit's sympathizers. Although the word "curialis" (*bouleutes*) does not occur in this epistle, Letoïus' competence could hardly have extended to any other than a *curialis*. In this instance he apparently tried to conscript an *assessor* of Rufinus by taking advantage of his chief's absence. The letter simply shows that Letoïus persisted in his work at the risk of clashing with high civil as well as military authority.

From *Or.* 48-49, however, we have learned that the *curia* urged its claims against certain officers in Julian's army, and we have seen that there were only about six months during which this could have been done, that is, from the late summer or early autumn of 362, when the empowering legislation was enacted, until March of 363, when the emperor left Antioch. What of Ammianus himself? In spite of his silence on the subject, there is reason to believe that he had stayed in the army even after 359 (see note 5), and virtually all critics except Momm-

sen have agreed that he accompanied the expeditionary force in one capacity or another, yet it would seem that he joined it rather tardily, when it had already reached Cercusium.¹⁷ His momentary delay in overtaking the main body of troops may have been caused by a skirmish with the *curia*, in which, however, he must have triumphed, since there were seemingly no more than three officers whom Letoius definitely succeeded in recalling to curial service.

We may close with a comment on the well-known digression in which the historian condemns the profession of law in the Near East,¹⁸ hinting that he himself has suffered at the hands of its practitioners.¹⁹ Since he gives more than passing attention to the disadvantages of the calling from the pleader's point of view (30. 4. 20-22), we might surmise that during his last years in Antioch and before his migration to Rome he made an effort to qualify for the bar.²⁰ His complaint that many attorneys are ill educated (*ibid.*, 14, 16-17) would fall naturally enough from the pen of one who, justly priding himself upon his literary attainments in an acquired language, may have turned in disgust from the law and have sought in the writing of history a worthier outlet for his ambitions. And the fact that many a *curialis* tried to shed his obligations by becoming an advocate suggests that Ammianus' im-

munity may once again have been called into question, though any such danger must have antedated the year 366, when he was free to travel to Greece (26. 10. 19). A stronger possibility, perhaps not wholly incompatible with the first, arises from the circumstance that most of the excursus deals with the manifold pettifoggeries of the men of law, as if the writer viewed himself in part as one of the clients whom they victimized.²¹ This may reflect some experience of Ammianus' during the treason trials of 371, which seem at least to have given him a serious fright,²² but an earlier misadventure back in 363 may also have influenced his attitude toward the bar, for we know that court hearings frequently ensued when *curiales* resisted conscription. In this regard we might observe that Ammianus speaks of Alexander, the oppressive governor of 363, as if his judicial functions were paramount over all others (see note 11).

In the last two paragraphs I have merely tried to show in a tentative way how certain biographical data of more or less objective value might be reconciled with the thesis of Ensslin and Thompson. Skeptics will always be at liberty to reject it, but they should first consider the supporting evidence furnished by Libanius.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOTES

1. *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus* (Cambridge, 1947), pp. 2, 81, and *passim*. Ammianus speaks of several *curiales* in sympathetic terms (25. 9. 3, 27. 7. 6, 28. 6. 4, 10, 18, 29. 2. 27), but more cogent is the fact that he takes the side of the *curia* in reporting its dispute with Julian (22. 14. 1-2), whom he greatly admired; cf. 14. 7. 2 for a somewhat similar episode in the caesarship of Gallus.

2. W. Ensslin, *Klio*, Beiheft XVI (1923), 5-6, cautiously followed by W. A. Baehrens, *JAW*, CCIII (1925), 83.

3. Cf. 22. 9. 8, where Ancyra is the scene: "... alii querentes consortiis se curialium addictos iniuste..." Ammianus could probably have cited specific cases in which residents of Ancyra were claimed for curial duty in 362. Libanius, whose acquaintance with the historian is evidenced by *Ep.* 1063 (983 W) of 392 and, less certainly, by *Ep.* 233 (234 W) of 360 (?), had several friends among the *curiales* of that city, and one of these, a physician named Achillius, faced the threat of conscription in that year (see Liban. *Ep.* 756 [668 W], and O. Seeck, *Die Briefe des Libanius zeitlich geordnet* [Leipzig,

1906], p. 48). In this paper the *Epistles* of Libanius are cited according to R. Foerster's Teubner edition, with Wolf's numbering (W) added parenthetically.

4. This was noted by Ensslin, *loc. cit.*

5. In fact it is probable, as Thompson has argued (*op. cit.*, pp. 10-11), that Ammianus served continuously until the end of the Persian campaign (cf. my remarks in *CW*, XLIII [1949], 77).

6. Julian's legislation on this subject is discussed by Ensslin, though without reference to the present problem, in *Klio*, XVIII (1923), 143-48.

7. Cf. also *Cod. Theod.* 12. 1. 53, as summarized above.

8. Ensslin (*loc. cit.* in note 6 above) says that "corporations" were to be set up to examine the other cases individually: "Für die anderen Fälle sollen Körperschaften eingesetzt werden zur Prüfung des Einzelfalles." This is his interpretation of the sentence: "Placuit etiam designare, quae corpora sunt [Gothofredus: *sint*], in quibus nominationis iuste sollempnitas exercetur..." But surely *corpora* means the *persons* who are defined in the next sentence as not exempt. Gothofredus so interprets the word, except that he oddly regards the *corpora* as forming a vague category somehow distinct from the *filii decurionum* and the rich *plebeii*.

9. *Misopogon* 368 A-n. This invective was composed during Julian's seventh month in Antioch (344 A), that is, probably in February, 363, when his departure was imminent (370 n).

10. One Siderius was governor in 361 (Liban. *Ep.* 307 [310 W]) and Seeck (*op. cit.*, p. 278) wished to extend his term into 362 on the basis of *Ep.* 697 (609 W), but Foerster makes his name in that letter a common noun, and G. Downey (*A Study of the Comites Orientis and the Consulares Syriae* [Princeton, 1939], p. 17) accordingly limits his tenure to 361.

11. "Ipse autem [sc. Iulianus] Antiochiam egressurus Heliopoliten quendam Alexandrum Syriae iuris dictioni praefecit, turbulentum et saevum: dicebatque non illum meruisse, sed Antiochensibus avaris et contumeliosis huius modi iudicem convenire" (Amm. 23. 2. 3). Of the six *consulares Syriae* known to have held office between 359 and 364, viz., Tryphonianus, Italicianus, Siderius, Alexander, Celsus, and Marcianus (Downey, *loc. cit.*), Alexander is the only one mentioned by Ammianus, though Celsus, whose term fell in the latter half of 363 and in 364, appears as the *praeses Ciliciae* of 361-62 (22. 9. 13).

12. Liban. *Ep.* 811 (722 W); cf. *Or.* 15. 74, where it is said that Alexander saved the city, but that his criticisms were unduly harsh.

13. *Ep.* 1392. 3-7 and 1366 (1450 and 1428 W), respectively; cf. Seeck, *op. cit.*, pp. 92-93, 163-64.

14. For his biography see Seeck, *op. cit.*, pp. 197-98; E. Wüst, *RE*, Supplementband VI, 225-27. Wüst differs from Seeck in identifying the Letolus of Liban. *Or.* 48. 42, 49. 19, *Ep.* 1365, 1405 (1427, 1459 W) with the nephew of that name, and not the better known uncle. This is probably right, since we last hear of the uncle, so it would seem, in 365, and the Letolus of *Or.* 49. 19 is still living about 388, a former *curialis* now represented in the *curia* by his son. Even the nephew was clearly old enough in 363 to have done the work ascribed to him. Wüst's correction was unfortunately overlooked in my paper, "Curiales in the Correspondence of Libanius," *TAPA*, LXXXII (1951).

15. The names are not helpful, because we have no reliable information about their bearers. So far as I know, no suggestion has been made about the identity of Macrentius. For Maternus see *RE*, XIV, 2194, citing Liban. *Or.* 48. 42, *Ep.* 1151, 1457 (1170, 1493 W) and Seeck, *op. cit.*, p. 420, where, however, he is regarded as an *assessor* to Palladius, the *praeses Isauriae* to whom the two letters are addressed. I doubt that this *assessor* can be the Maternus of *Or.* 48, because there we have to do with an army officer, and it is improbable that Letolus would have tried to conscript a man in Isauria. E. Richtsteig, in his Index of the proper names in Libanius (Vol. XII of Foerster's edition), identifies the Julianus of *Or.* 48. 42 with the *curialis* of that name who about 388-89 was imprisoned by Eustathius, a governor of Syria (*Or.* 54. 22-25, 45); but neither Sievers nor Seeck, as cited by Richtsteig, actually makes this rather unlikely identification.

16. Socrates *Hist. Eccl.* 3. 17 (Migne, *PG*, LXVII, 424), remarks that the presence of a large army in the city (cf. Liban. *Or.* 11. 177-78) contributed to the economic crisis of 362-63 (see G. Downey, "The Economic Crisis at Antioch under Julian the Apostate," *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson* [Princeton, 1951], pp. 312-21).

17. Thompson (*op. cit.*, p. 10) notes that Ammianus' use of the first person begins at the point where the army is leaving Cercusium en route to Zalitha (23. 5. 7).

18. 30. 4. 5-22 (cf. 8: *per eos omnes tractus*).

19. Cf. 30. 4. 4: ... *indignitate ... quam in illis partibus agens expertus sum*.

20. Cf. Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

21. For this interpretation see M. L. W. Laistner, *The Greater Roman Historians* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1947), p. 158.

22. Cf. 29. 2. 4: ... *omnes ea tempestate velut in Cimneriis tenebris reptabamus*.

A THESSALIAN FAMILY UNDER THE PRINCIPATE

J. A. O. LARSEN

FASCINATING glimpses of the life of various parts of the ancient world can often be deduced from the detailed analysis of documents in themselves anything but interesting. Often they are difficult to interpret, and, if the one who undertakes the first study is not completely successful, he should still be credited with laying the foundations for future work. What is presented here are merely a few remarks starting from work done by others and undoubtedly leaving much for later scholars to add. Even so the deductions to be made seem of sufficient value to be presented.

Recently James H. Oliver in a review of two books by Groag on Roman officials in Achaëa called attention to the connection between the Athenian eponymous archon, M. Ulpus Eubiotus Leurus, and the family of Eubiotei and Cylli of Hypata, the old Aenian city, which under the Empire was a member of the Thessalian League (*AJP*, LXIX [1948], 434-41 at 440f.). The dissertation of Guilelmus Kroog, *De foederis Thessalorum praetoribus (Dissertationes philologicae Halenses, XVIII* [1911], 1-64), makes it possible to carry the story farther. The latter work is the basis also for the list of generals given by Kern in *IG*, IX, 2. It should now be supplemented by the list of generals mentioned in inscriptions published by A. S. Arbanitopullos. This list, to be found in *Arch. eph.*, 1917, pp. 146-50, gives references to inscriptions published by him in various places. If the stemmas given by Kroog (pp. 37 and

64) and Oliver are joined together, they will cover a period from the beginning of the reign of Augustus to well into the third century after Christ. The resulting stemma would be largely conjectural, would not tell the whole story, and would need a little retouching here and there. Hence the method to be followed will be to make a few remarks about the various individuals involved and then to try to see what can be concluded from the evidence collected. First, however, it is necessary to discuss an inscription which Kroog and Kern misinterpreted.

IG, IX, 2, 1041 — three rather than one inscription — is from the base of a statue of Euphronius the son of Pasicles erected at Gonnus. On each of two sides there have been cut short manumission records. In one (b) the general of the Thessalian League is Cyllus son of Eubiotus; the other (c) is dated στρατηγούυτος Κόλλου Γ. In *IG* Kern resolves this as meaning that Cyllus was general for the third time, and Kroog (p. 36) takes the Cyllus of both inscriptions to be the same man and thus has only one Cyllus in his list of generals. The one dissenting voice is that of E. Preuner (*Ath. Mitt.*, XXVIII [1903], 377), who takes it to mean that Cyllus was a son and, in turn, a grandson of a Cyllus. This must be correct. The use of a numeral in this way may not be as common in Thessaly as in some other places, but δὲς is used thus in *IG*, IX, 2, 392 and possibly 230. On the other hand, when a numeral is used to indicate repeated tenure of the generalship,

whether only a single letter is used or the ordinal is spelled out in full, it is regularly preceded by $\tau\acute{o}$ (so in *IG*, IX, 2, 21. 13; 256 b. 1; 544. 8; 1269. 2; 1298. 12; other examples in the inscriptions published by Arbanitopullos). Thus Cyllus III, the son and grandson of Cyllus, is to be distinguished from Cyllus the son of Eubiotus. It is only chance which has placed the two on the base of the same statue.

This should not be too surprising to anyone who has read Lolling's brief account, which accompanied the original publication of the inscription in *Ath. Mitt.*, IX (1884), 299f. The two manumission records must be considerably later than the dedication, and Lolling notes that under the second (c, the one with Cyllus III) there are signs of an earlier inscription, of which several letters were still visible. Kern does not note this, but the inscription had suffered much by the time he saw it. Hence Cyllus III in all likelihood is later than Cyllus the son of Eubiotus.

Already when Kroog wrote there was other evidence to show that a simple stemma with a Eubiotus and a Cyllus alternating generation after generation does not tell the whole story. Kroog himself recognized a general named Eubiotus whom he was unable to fit into his stemma. Then there was the record of a pair of manumitters at Hypata named Cyllus and Eubiotus (*IG*, IX, 2, 15. 4 and 7), in all likelihood brothers. Later the inscriptions published by Arbanitopullos have added so many references to individuals bearing these two names that the situation has become still more complicated. Thus there is a Eubiotus (No. 2, below) who does not even seem to belong to the family from Hypata. However, the restoration of *IG*, IX, 2, 1290 by Arbanitopullos (*Arch. eph.*, 1913, pp. 167f.)

which shows a Eubiotus and a Cyllus as generals in successive years can be ignored. Arbanitopullos reads Cyllus twice (ll. 26f. and 32f.), but in both cases only the last syllable is preserved, so that it would seem that the name of the general might just as well be Thal-lus or Italus or Cephalus or some other name with the same last syllable, especially since the inscription is not well enough preserved to enable us to determine the number of letters in the name. The generalship of Eubiotus, however, seems more certain, and thus we have one more mention of a general by that name. He may be one of those already known, or he may be still another. Arbanitopullos dates the inscription soon after the birth of Christ. Possibly this Eubiotus may be the son of Eu-colus (No. 2).

1. Eubiotus was general of the Thessalian League just before Augustus (*IG*, IX, 2, 415 a. 38); Kroog (p. 38) places his generalship shortly before 27 B.C. Arbanitopullos dates him 28/7 B.C. but identifies him incorrectly with our No. 2. The name occurs as that of an eponymous magistrate in connection with manumissions and is given without any indication of origin.

2. Eubiotus, the son of Eu-colus and the adopted son of Clearchus the son of Hegesaretus, served as general probably about the time of the birth of Christ. He is not in Kroog's list but was known to him only as *tagos* of Larissa (*IG*, IX, 2, 549). The evidence for his generalship is to be found in *Arch. eph.*, 1917, p. 25, No. 313. 12. Arbanitopullos (*ibid.*, pp. 28f.) is willing to consider him a member of the family of Hypata, though he and Clearchus obviously belong at Larissa, and though there is no more reason for assigning Eu-colus to Hypata. Further, he identifies him with No. 1, although the latter had as his predecessor Themistogenes, while the son of Eu-colus had as his Hegesias. This point may not be too much of an obstacle, for apparently the records of Hegesias and Eubiotus are cut by different hands, so that Hegesias need not be the immediate predecessor. The final dating

of Arbanitopullos is: Themistogenes 30/29 B.C., Hegesias 29/8, Eubiotus the son of Eucolus 28/7, Augustus 27/6. He is probably right in identifying Hegesaretus with the man of that name who was the leader of the Pompeian faction in Thessaly in 48 (Caesar *BC* 3. 35. 2). But is it not almost impossible to believe that the adopted son of his son could have been elected general as soon as twenty years after this?

For a more secure dating of Eubiotus the son of Eucolus we have the following data: He served as *tagos* when Demotheres was general. The latter has been dated by Kroog (p. 45) about the time of Christ. Moreover, Hegesias, the forerunner of Eubiotus as general, has been dated about the same time by Preuner (*Ath. Mitt.*, XXVIII, 371-82) and Kroog (pp. 44f.). These scholars were not at the time interested in dating Eubiotus the son of Eucolus, and their arguments have not been refuted and should be accepted until this is done. Hence it seems best to place Eubiotus also at about the time of the birth of Christ and to conclude that he was from Larissa and not Hypata. Furthermore, there seems to be no proof that he was related to the family of Hypata, though, since leading families in various cities intermarried, relationship cannot be definitely excluded.

3. A Cyllus probably was general in the reign of Tiberius. Kroog (pp. 36f.) places the one Cyllus he recognizes as general in the reign of Augustus and makes him the son of the Eubiotus who served shortly before Augustus (No. 1). He further identifies him with Cyllus the son of Eubiotus of *IG*, IX, 2, 1041b, whom he also takes to be identical with Cyllus III. The latter is connected with the generalship of Sosipater through Xenocritus the son of Nicostratus, who was treasurer at Gonnus both under him (*IG*, IX, 2, 1043) and under Cyllus III. Then by restoring Κύλλου for what was first read as ΚΥΔ in *IG*, IX, 2, 543. 12 — a restoration generally accepted — he gets the following sequence for generals in successive years: Sosipater, Xenon, Cyllus, Meneceles, and places the entire group in the reign of Augustus. This seems to be dating the undateable by the undateable and to have little in its favor except a feeling that a Cyllus son of Eubiotus ought to have been general about a generation after the first Eubiotus and

about a generation before the one of A.D. 43/4 (No. 4). There should be some better guide to possible dates.

First there is the link with Sosipater. Besides one who followed a Pausanias, whom Kroog dates 184/3 B.C., two generals by this name can be dated approximately, one in the reign of Claudius probably not earlier than A.D. 50 (*Arch. eph.*, 1917, p. 36, No. 320. 32; the number of the year of the reign of Claudius has been lost, but most of the earlier years have been preempted), and one in the time of the Flavians or later. The date for the latter is derived from an inscription which shows that a Sosipater came after Flavius Polycritus, general for the second time, and Claudius Aristophylus (*IG*, IX, 2, 256). Thus it is clear that Cyllus III served as general about A.D. 55 or a generation or so later depending upon after which Sosipater we append the series, Xenon, Cyllus, Meneceles. Probably the later of the two dates is to be preferred, for we have already seen that Cyllus III appears to have been relatively late.

There is, however, evidence also for a Cyllus who served at an earlier date. The name is found in an inscription which is one of a group of short manumission records carved on the various sides of a block of marble (*Arch. eph.*, 1917, pp. 129-32, Nos. 343-46; Cyllus appears in 345. 5). In such a case the dating of one inscription will not necessarily give us the dates of the others. In No. 345, judging by the description given by Arbanitopullos, lines 1-3 and 4f. are quite differently cut, so that it appears as two rather than one inscription. In line 1 Harmon is the general, and he has already been placed in the reign of Augustus by Kroog (pp. 42f.). It seems safe to conclude that lines 4f. are later and that, therefore, the generalship of Cyllus should be placed later than that of Harmon. How much later it is difficult to say. Another inscription, however, shows a Cyllus following or later than the fourth generalship of Antigonus (*Arch. eph.*, 1913, pp. 181f.). Since coins show an Antigonus both under Augustus and under Tiberius (Mionnet, *Description des médailles*, Suppl. III, 268-70, Nos. 54, 68, 70, 71), it is natural to conclude that the coins refer to the same general and that his fourth generalship probably came under Tiberius. This places one Cyllus

early in the reign of Tiberius. This may well be Cyllus the son of Eubiotus of *IG*, IX, 2, 1041b, who we have already seen was in all likelihood earlier than Cyllus III. The latter, in fact, may possibly have been a grandson of Cyllus son of Eubiotus; and Eubiotus, in turn, may well have been our No. 1. At least the time fits better for him than for No. 2.

4. A third Eubiotus served as general in A.D. 43/4 (*IG*, IX, 2, 206. iii c). He is one of a number of generals dated by the years of the reign of Claudius. His predecessor was Dicaeus; his successor, Lycophron.

5. Apparently still another Eubiotus served as general in the Flavian period or immediately before. In an inscription from Hypata (*IG*, IX, 2, 19) he appears as general in the year before Polycritus. Kroeg identifies the latter with Flavius Polycritus, listed in *IG*, IX, 2, 256 as general for the second time, who may well have received his Roman citizenship in the interval between the two generalships. Another inscription lists a Rubrius Polycritus as general for the second time (*Arch. eph.*, 1910, p. 362, No. 7). The reference to the second generalship suggests that this is the same Polycritus, whose name is given in incomplete form in both documents, the full form probably being Titus Flavius Rubrius Polycritus. The connection of the Eubiotus of the Hypata inscription with Flavius Polycritus is considered possible also by Arbanitopullos, though he remarks that the Hypata inscription obviously is earlier than the other two. In any case, this Eubiotus cannot have been the general of A.D. 43/4 (No. 4), since the latter had as his successor Lycophron. This is the Eubiotus for whom Kroeg found no place in his stemma.

6. Cyllus II must be presupposed as the father of Cyllus III. So far no further entry fitting him has turned up. As far as time is concerned, the grandfather of Cyllus III may have been our No. 3. Thus Cyllus II may have been a brother of Eubiotus, the general of A.D. 43/4.

7. It has already been noted that Cyllus III probably served as general in Flavian times or later and is to be identified with the Cyllus who followed Sosipater and Xenon and preceded Meneceles. In this dating Sosipater is taken to be the

successor of Flavius Polycritus and Claudius Aristophylus. The other alternative is to start from the Sosipater of ca. A.D. 50, but the later date is more likely and should not be excluded on the ground that it may place the generalship of Cyllus after the grant of Roman citizenship to a member of the family. In the first place, the generalship may not have come after the grant, for the grant of citizenship to T. Flavius Cyllus (No. 8) may have come very late in the reign of Domitian. Moreover, it is poor methodology to conclude that every reference to a Cyllus or Eubiotus of Hypata without a Roman nomen must antedate this grant. To cite an illustration, in the case of two brothers at Oenoanda in Lycia, one seems to have received the citizenship under Nero; the other, under Vespasian.¹ As for Hypata, the connection of a Eubiotus with no indication of citizenship with the general T. A(elius) Sabinianus (*IG*, IX, 2, 20), who must be placed under Hadrian or later, is enough to suggest that after the Flavian period there could be Eubioti at Hypata who were not citizens. What is true for Eubioti is true also for Cylli, and Cyllus III may be an illustration. To be sure, as far as the time is concerned, it is possible that Cyllus III was the Cyllus who received Roman citizenship and was the father of T. Flavius Eubiotus, but it may be more likely that the cousin with Panhellenic prominence (No. 8) should be the one to be so honored. At any rate, it is possible that one cousin — if they were cousins — received the citizenship and that the other did not.

8. A Cyllus son of Eubiotus was *epimeletes* of the Amphictionic League during the reign of Domitian *SIG*³, 822 = *Fouilles de Delphes*, III, 1, No. 538; for the date, cf. *PIR*², I, A 1410). He has been identified with T. Flavius Cyllus, who is named on the base of a statue of his son erected by the city of Hypata, obviously to honor a prominent townsman (*IG*, IX, 2, 44). This is all the more likely since also the son (No. 9) was an *epimeletes*. This would mean that Cyllus received the citizenship late in the reign of Domitian.

9. T. Flavius Eubiotus, the son of T. Flavius Cyllus, was also *epimeletes* of the Amphictionic League. He is mentioned in an inscription at Delphi (*BCH*, XX [1896], 720, No. 414; cf. *ibid.*, XXI, 475)

and was honored at Hypata. There he is described as high priest and agonothete of the Theoi Sebastoi, that is, in the municipal imperial cult,² agonothete of the Pythian Games, *epimeletes* of the Amphictionic League, and Helladarch. Possibly also the latter title represents a dignity connected with the Amphictionic League and distinct from the office with the same name in the Achaeae or Panachaeae League (Stähelin, *RE*, VIII, 97). Though Eubiotus is honored as *euergetes*, it is noticeable that the only local dignity mentioned is the highpriesthood and agonothesia of the municipal imperial cult. No magistracy of the city is listed. It seems that it was primarily for his Panhellenic services and dignity that he was honored by his fellow townsmen. The latter, by the way, were accustomed to having close contact with the Amphictionic League, and the office of *epimeletes* was held not only by Cyllus and Eubiotus but also by at least two other citizens of Hypata, L. Cassius Petraeus (*SIG*³, 825) and Sosander the son of Pleistarchus (*Fouilles de Delphes*, III, 4, No. 63).³

10. T. Flavius Cyllus was archon of the Panhellenes in A.D. 156 (*OGI*, 504; cf. n. 4 for the date). Oliver takes him to be identical with Cyllus the *epimeletes*, but that is impossible. More likely he is a grandson and a son of No. 9. (So Preuner, *Ath. Mitt.*, XXVIII [1903], 377f.; Bourguet, commentary on *Fouilles de Delphes*, III, 1, No. 538; Stähelin, *RE*, IX, 239.)

11. Another T. Flavius Eubiotus can be posited as the father of No. 12 and may well be the son of No. 10. A Eubiotus and a Habroea, obviously husband and wife, occur as manumitters at Hypata (*IG*, IX, 2, 30; cf. 29 and 32). They are taken by Oliver to be our T. Flavius Eubiotus and his wife, the parents of No. 12. If this is correct, it means that a Roman citizen is listed by his *cognomen* alone. Since the latter is a normal Greek name, and as Thessaly appears to have remained very Greek, this is possible.

12. Flavia Habroea is listed on an Athenian base as the wife of Ulpus Leurus and the mother of Eubiotus (*IG*, II², 3695), obviously M. Ulpus Eubiotus Leurus (No. 13). Her own name shows that she came from a family with the *nomen* Flavius, -a, and this combined with the first *cognomen* of her son makes it practically

certain that she came from the Thessalian family of Eubioti and Cylli. Another inscription (*IG*, II², 3696; cf. 4053 and Oliver, *The Sacred Gerusia*, p. 132, n. 23) honors a Flavia Habroea of consular rank. This is usually taken to be the same woman, but would a woman be described as *ὑπατική* merely because her son had attained the rank? May not this Habroea rather be the wife of Eubiotus?⁴

13. M. Ulpus Eubiotus Leurus, the son of the preceding, was eponymous archon of Athens and attained consular rank. He is mentioned in a considerable number of Athenian inscriptions (Oliver, *Gerusia*, No. 31; *IG*, II², 3695, 3697-3702) and was probably also honored by the Thessalian League in a decree so far unpublished (*Arch. Anz.*, LV [1940], 248 cited by Oliver, *Gerusia*, p. 132, n. 23). Obviously his first *cognomen* is taken over from his mother's family and in all likelihood from his grandfather. His two sons were M. Ulpus Flavius Teisamenus and M. Ulpus Pupienus Maximus. The latter name suggests some connection with the emperor Pupienus, probably before he became emperor. As already stated, probably the wife as well as the mother of Eubiotus Leurus was named Habroea. He may well have married a Thessalian cousin.

Most of the Cylli and Eubioti listed above — probably all except Eubiotus the son of Eucolus — must have been members of a single family from Hypata. At least two Cylli, one general (probably No. 3) and the *epimeletes* of the Amphictionic League (No. 8), were sons of Eubioti, while T. Flavius Eubiotus (No. 9) was the son of T. Flavius Cyllus. It is true that a glance at the Index of *IG*, IX, 2 will show that Eubiotus was a common name in Thessaly (cf. also Y. Béquignon, *Recherches archéologiques à Phères de Thessalie* [1937], p. 84, No. 35), but there are enough indications of filiation to make it fairly certain that we have before us members of a single family, at least if we consider the tendency under the Empire to develop hereditary aristocracies. The likelihood that we are

dealing with a single family is strengthened by the rarity of the name Cyllus. There was a manumitter by that name at the Phthiotic city of Halus (*IG*, IX, 2, 109a. 7),⁵ but there seems to be no other Cyllus attested who has to be located in any other city than Hypata. The definite evidence for T. Flavius Cyllus and his son T. Flavius Eubiotus as well as the occurrence at Hypata of the two pairs of manumitters, Cyllus and Eubiotus and Habroea and Eubiotus (*IG*, IX, 2, 15 and 30), make it clear that the family hailed from Hypata.

It was stated above that a simple stemma with a Cyllus and a Eubiotus alternating generation after generation does not tell the whole story presented by our evidence. It may now be added that not all the references to a general named Eubiotus have been connected with one of those whose dates have been fixed approximately. This is the case with *Arch. eph.*, 1913, p. 168 (*IG*, IX, 2, 1290) and 1917, p. 12, No. 305. They may or may not refer to generals known from other sources. Similarly, it may be remembered that it is not entirely certain that Cyllus the son of Eubiotus of *IG*, IX, 2, 1041b is the general of the early part of the reign of Tiberius. In addition there is a reference to a Eubiotus, general for the second time, in *IG*, IX, 2, 541; no one has yet been able to determine which Eubiotus this is. Yet all this evidence may refer to individuals who have been placed and need not cause modification of Kroog's stemma. What has complicated matters is above all the recognition that Cyllus III must have had a father as well as a grandfather named Cyllus. However, if it is granted that the stemma of Kroog otherwise is plausible, this need cause little trouble. It is easy to see that so far as the inter-

val of time is concerned, Cyllus, the general of the early part of the reign of Tiberius, may well have been the grandfather. If, as seems likely, it was the normal practice in the family to name the oldest son after his grandfather, then Cyllus II was probably the younger son and thus the younger brother of the Eubiotus who was general in A.D. 43/4. It now becomes easy to suggest a possible place also for the Eubiotus who was general in the Flavian period and whom Kroog could not fit into his stemma. He may well have been a son of Cyllus II and a brother of Cyllus III. When their cousin, the *epimeletes*, received Roman citizenship, these two brothers may not have done so. This branch of the family may also have had descendants who were not Roman citizens. To be sure, much of this is conjectural.

The history of the family of the Cylli and Eubioti and the careers of its individual members show that there was in Thessaly as in other parts of the Roman Empire a sort of hierarchy of dignities open to local citizens. The classification, however, is a little different from that of a western province, partly because Thessaly was a federal state and partly because Panhellenic dignities constituted a special category. In the west, to be sure, service as high priest of a provincial assembly may be considered a dignity intermediate between municipal offices and positions in the service of the Empire. Whether there was anything exactly corresponding to this open to a Thessalian, is not entirely clear, but there was an opportunity to serve in the Amphictionic League and, after Hadrian, in the Panhellenion. Thus the categories of offices and honors to be considered are four: offices in the cities or municipalities within the Thessalian League,

federal offices, Panhellenic dignities, and positions in the service of the Roman Empire. The first impression received from the records of the individuals studied is that, when a higher station in life had been reached, the lower honors tended to be scorned or refused. Except for Eubiotus the son of Eucolus, who served as *tagos* in Larissa, we lack proof that the generals we have studied had filled municipal offices, while for those who had attained higher dignities we do not even have a record that they served as generals of the Thessalian League. This, however, may be a false impression due to the nature of the evidence. Most of the information about the generals is derived from the use of their names for dating the payment of fees in connection with the manumission of slaves. Inscriptions giving the *cursus* of Thessalians are almost or entirely non-existent. Hence the information that Eubiotus the son of Eucolus served both as *tagos* at Larissa and as general is derived from two different inscriptions. It is natural to suppose that federal officials normally were men who already had held local offices, a fact often expressed in the west by *omnibus honoribus apud suos functus* and similar phrases (e.g., Dessau, 6930, 6937, 7017-20, 7041, 7050) and, if our information were fuller, we should probably hear more of generals who had filled local offices. Yet, we cannot fail to notice that, when T. Flavius Eubiotus, the *epimeletes* of the Amphictionic League, was honored by his fellow townsmen, local and federal magistracies were not mentioned. To be sure, they may be concealed behind the epithet *euergetes*,⁶ but they do not seem to have carried enough prestige to deserve to be listed alongside of the higher dignities. If this is correct, even when lower offices are

not mentioned, prominent Thessalians may well have filled them before advancing to higher dignities. Yet, whatever was the case in Thessaly, the example of M. Ulpius Eubiotus Leurus suggests that even in the third century after Christ the eponymous archontate of Athens carried prestige.

If even the generalship of the Thessalian League may have been of little moment in comparison with higher Panhellenic dignities, the office seems to have carried prestige at home. At any rate, examples of repeated tenure continue into the second century after Christ. A glance at Kroog's list of generals shows also that the majority were not Roman citizens. That is not surprising. There is no reason why Roman citizenship should be required of the head of what was a federal state conducting local government rather than a "provincial assembly."⁷ In Thessaly, however, the number of Roman citizens seems to have been small even in the second century after Christ. The inscriptions, in fact, give the impression that Thessaly was somewhat of a land apart. The first impression derived from the many manumission records is that the chief occupation must have been the freeing of slaves. Though this impression obviously is false, the fact that such an important activity was supervised by local authorities according to old Thessalian forms, is significant and suggests that the Thessalians to a considerable extent actually governed themselves. Another piece of evidence is an imperial rescript on a point of law addressed to the Thessalian League (*Dig.* 5. 1. 37 and 48. 6. 5. 1). The relatively late date — under Hadrian or Antoninus Pius — suggests that the experiment of leaving local administration to local authorities was unusually successful in Thes-

saly. Apparently freedom was less of a farce here than in some parts of the Empire. This may be accounted for in part by the fact that Augustus not only had recognized the freedom of Thessaly but had given her a prominent place in the Amphictionic League with the same number of votes as Nicopolis and Macedonia. Thus encouraged the Thessalians appear to have continued active in local politics and Panhellenic affairs. The leading families seem to have developed a hereditary aristocracy which supplied most of the high offices. Judging by the example of the Cylli and Eubioti of Hypata, this included not only families from Thessaly proper but also from the districts acquired later. The more prominent members of the family also took part in Panhellenic affairs, particularly those of the Amphictionic League. At least one citizen served also as archon of the Panhellenion. A very few of the prominent Thessalians were honored with Roman citizenship. It is interesting to note that here too the Flavian period was one of relatively many grants. Whether there was a loss of vitality caused by the decrease in representation in the Amphictionic League by Hadrian and by the transfer of Thessaly to the province of Macedonia by him or Antoninus Pius, it is difficult to say.⁸

We have thus before us one of the few Thessalian families to have attained Roman citizenship. This it seems to have done in the last part of the reign of Domitian. It obviously was a family of considerable importance. The position of archon of the Panhellenion held by No. 10 was about as high a position as a Greek could attain except in the imperial service. No wonder, then, that a daughter of the family, Flavia Habroea (No. 12), should be wooed by a

scion of a family which attained prominence somewhat later, Ulpus Leurus, obviously from a family which attained its Roman citizenship in the reign of Trajan. Since their son, M. Ulpus Eubiotus Leurus, was eponymous archon at Athens, it is natural to think that also the father was an Athenian. Oliver (*AJP*, LXIX, 440) may be right, however, in questioning this on the ground that in *IG*, II², 3695 Ulpus Leurus has no demotic. The omission of the demotic even in as brief and compressed inscription as this may be significant (cf. its use *ibid.*, 3763), but even more significant in the case of a name as extremely rare as Leurus⁹ is the following couplet from the *Palatine Anthology* (11. 16):

Κύλλος καὶ Λεῦρος δύο Θεσσαλοὶ ἐγ-
χεσίμωροι
Κύλλος δ' ἐκ τούτων ἐγχεσιμωρότερος.

The implied slur on the two gentlemen does not concern us. What does concern us is that Cyllus and Leurus are grouped together as Thessalians. The conclusion must be that Ulpus Leurus may well have sprung from a Thessalian family which moved in the same circles as the Cylli and Eubioti, though the inscriptions do not seem to have turned up the record of any other Thessalian Leurus. The son, M. Ulpus Eubiotus Leurus, who not only was eponymous archon of Athens but also attained consular rank, obviously rated his mother's family higher than that of his father. When he used only one *cognomen* (*IG*, II², 3699, 3700, 3701, 3702), the name used was Eubiotus. He, too, as already noted, seems to have married a Flavia Habroea from Thessaly. With their children new *cognomina* entered the family. Probably the first *cognomen* of M. Ulpus Flavius Teisamenus was derived from the *nomen* of

his mother and thus again commemorated the distinguished Thessalian family.¹¹

M. Ulpianus Eubiotus Leurus with his Thessalian connections is in any case an illustration of the cosmopolitan character and composition of the Athenian aristocracy of the time. It may seem surprising that a Thessalian not only should acquire Athenian citizenship but also be elected eponymous archon. But is this more surprising than that Quintus Trebellius Rufus of Tolosa, a former high priest of Narbonensis, should serve in this capacity?¹² Connections of Athenian families with Asia Minor probably are less surprising. An example is Claudia Ammia Agrippina, daughter of the Asiarch Claudius Themistocles, who was married to a prominent Athenian

(*IG*, II², 3704). The example is equally important whether she was the real daughter of Claudius Themistocles or, as it has recently been maintained,¹³ the adopted daughter. To be sure, if she was the real daughter of the Asiarch, as I believe, there is indirect evidence of earlier intermarriage between the Asianic and Athenian families, for the lady is also described as of Marathonian descent. At any rate, it is a far cry from the law of citizenship of Pericles to the spirit of this aristocracy, which rather suggests Homer and archaic Greece. The examples adduced suggest further that this aristocracy, whether the individuals had their roots in Gaul or Thessaly or Asia, continued to prize recognition and prominence at Athens.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

NOTES

1. *IGR*, III, 500, a genealogical inscription from Oenanda in Lycia; cf. Larsen, "*Tituli Asiae Minoris*, II, 522 and the Dating of Greek Inscriptions by Roman Names," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, V (1946), 55-63 at 57f.

2. So Bourguet, *De rebus Delphicis imperatoriae aetatis* (1905), p. 53; F. Geiger, *De sacerdotibus Augustorum municipalibus* (*Diss. Hal.*, XXIII [1913], 1-145), p. 116; *SIG*³, 825, n. 4. The peculiar title has not been translated in full. In addition to the inscriptions listed by Geiger cf. also *SIG*³, 825c.

3. The *epimeletai* are discussed by A. B. West, "Notes on Achaean Prosopography and Chronology," *CP*, XXIII (1928), 258-69.

4. The use of ἑπαρισσοῖ in inscriptions in such a way as to indicate by what right a woman bore the title is rare. In *IGR*, III, 581; IV, 911, 1741 and apparently also in III, 500.iii.4 (cf. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, V, 61) the adjective is applied to wives; in *IGR*, IV, 1378 and 1382 to a woman who probably was both daughter and wife of consulars. The expression πατὴρ ἑπαρισσοῦ in *IGR*, III, 500.ii.65f. suggests that it was not natural to apply the adjective to a parent of a consul or consular.

5. This is the only occurrence of the name listed by F. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen des griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit* (1917), p. 492.

6. In this connection it may be well to call attention to Luke 22:25: "The kings of the gentiles (*ethne*) lord it over them, and those who have authority over them are called *evergetai*." The passage suggests that the epithet was applied frequently not in recognition of genuine benefactions but for the exercise of authority. Thus it is possible that the benefactions of Eubiotus consisted in service as a magistrate at Hypata.

7. Another federal state in which Roman citizenship was not required of the head was Lycia (Larsen, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, V, 62, n. 15). On the other hand, Roman citizenship was required of the high priest of

Narbonensis (Dessau, 6964), and the known examples of *sacerdotes* of the Three Gauls give the impression that, though the tribal affiliation is not indicated, they too were Roman citizens. (Examples can be found through the Index of Dessau, III, p. 579.) A hurried glance at evidence from other provinces leaves a similar impression. Thus Roman citizenship may have been a common requirement for the high priests of western provincial assemblies. The situation in those eastern *koines* which resemble western provincial assemblies more closely than do the Thessalian and Lycian leagues, is another question. A study of some of the evidence combined with a glance at the tables in Magie's *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, Volume II, has given the impression that the high priests of such organizations as the *Commune Asiae* were normally Roman citizens, but that this citizenship was not a requirement.

8. On the freedom of the Thessalian League, cf. *Econ. Surv. Rome*, IV, 447f.; on the reorganization of the Amphictionic League by Augustus see now *CP*, XLVII (1952), 14 and n. 42; on Hadrian's reorganization, *ibid.*, p. 13 and n. 36; on the transfer of Thessaly to Macedonia, *Econ. Surv. Rome*, IV, 439 and n. 7.

9. Leuros is a name even more rare than Kyllos. Pape-Benseler lists for it only *Pal. Anth.* II, 16; Bechtel, *Historische Personennamen*, does not have the name at all; it is not found in the Index of *IG*, IX, 2.

10. The exact meaning to be read into ἔγγεστομωρος is not clear, but it obviously is meant to imply stupidity. Thus the point of the epigram is that an old Homeric epithet is used with a new and derogatory meaning. The author is usually held to be Ammianus, who lived early in the second century after Christ and wrote jeering epigrams; cf. Reitzenstein, *RE*, s.v. "Ammianus" (1); Christ-Schmid-Stählin, *Griech. Lit.*, Part II, Vol. II, p. 674). If the poem is by Ammianus, it is contemporary evidence for the two men or, at least, the two names. Since Kyllos is attested for Hypata and Halus but is

commonest at Hypata, the epigram fits a time when these two cities were regarded as Thessalian. In fact, it fits the second century so well that this is a strong argument for the attribution to Ammianus. Pape-Benseler, to be sure, cites it as the twenty-third poem of Alcaeus of Messene, the contemporary of Philip V. I have found no edition in which it is so listed. The Brunk-Jacobs edition, in which the poems are grouped by authors, has twenty-two entries under Alcaeus (I, 237-42) and places the Kyllos-Leuros epigram as No. 23 under Ammianus (III, 97). The attribution to Alcaeus probably was made on the ground that ἐγγεσιμῶτος implies a time when Thessalians were involved in actual warfare, but that is unlikely. The emphasis seems to be on the stupidity or ineptness of the men rather than on their spears. In all likelihood, too, the author did not so much

satirize specific individuals as play with their names. Kyllos, of course, means "Clubfoot"; Leuros is more difficult. The emphasis on the names is found in the following translation by Hugo Grotius:

Desipiunt gladiis duo Thessala nomina, Cyllus
scilicet et Leurus, sed magis ille tamen.

For this version see Bosch, *Anthologia graeca*, I (1795), 377.

11. Examples of *cognomina* derived from the *nomen* of a mother are Gaius Licinius Flavianus and Licinia Flavia, children of Licinius Thoas and Flavia Platonis in *IGR*, III, 500. ii. 39-40; iii. 58-59; vi. 4-14.

12. For the more recent literature see *L'Année épigraphique*, 1947, No. 69.

13. By Oliver in his important study "Two Athenian Poets," *Hesperia*, Suppl. VIII (1949), 243-58.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

A SECOND PROPERTIUS FLORILEGIUM

Documents on the medieval *Fortleben* of Propertius are sparse and uncertain. The paucity and confusion of the early manuscripts of the *Elegies* are well known. Possible traces of his influence have been alleged in the works of Alcuin, Hildebert of Le Mans, Henry of Settimello, Albert of Stade, and Jean de Meung, but most of these are far from certain. The occasional inclusion of his name in such catalogues of poets as that in the *Metamorphosis Goliae* simply bespeaks an acquaintance with Apuleius. In this bibliographical vacuum even the incidental historical and critical indications of the medieval florilegium are welcome. So far, however, only one collection of Propertian *flores*, that contained in the thirteenth century florilegium now in Vat. Reg. Lat. 2120, has been reported.¹ Consequently, a brief account of another Propertius florilegium may be of some interest. This is found in MS 16708 of the *Fonds Latin* in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*. It is included in an otherwise unremarkable assortment of classical and medieval authors copied, apparently, by a French scribe in the second half of the fourteenth century.² Some seventy lines from the *Elegies* have been set down and joined with an almost equal number from Tibullus under the perplexed rubric, *Secuntur Flosculi propercii Tibulli de amore*. A list of the lines included in it together with the readings (exclusive of misspellings) unreported from the manuscripts follows:

1. 1. 17-18 *nec mecum*; 1. 25-26; 1. 33-36 *et ullo*; 2. 1 *praecedere*; 2. 4-5 *in tanto p. vultu*; 2. 7-8; 2. 29-30 *probit*; 7. 26; 8. 29 *deponit*; 8. 39-40 *potui in*; 9. 7-8 *opposito*; 13. 15-16 *nec nihil*; 17. 13-14 *minuto g.*; 18. 7-8; 2. 1. 43-44 *tractat a.*; 1. 47; 1. 57-58 *non habet*; 3. 5-8 *tollit verus*; 7. 11-12; 9. 7-8; 9. 31-32; 15. 1-2 *nox mea*; 15. 23; 15. 54; 18. 1-2; 21. 15; 23. 23-24 *ulla iam... quisque a. velit*; 26. 27-28 *in avide ... multam et*; 27.

11-12; 30. 1-2 *sequatur*; 30. 7; 32. 55-56 *venere*; 33. 33; 34. 3; 3. 8. 19 *tuta f.*; 13. 49-50 *vox seq.*; 17. 2 *paccare v.*

Most of these novel variants are, as is usual with florilegia, clearly worthless. Of the few that are not impossible, the most interesting is the attractive *habet* (2. 1. 57). Printed by Hosius as an emendation of Schrader's, this reading is also found in Vat. Reg. Lat. 2120, to which the present collection does not appear to be related.

Our florilegium's general affinities with the A tradition are obvious. It reads, for example, *numerabar inter amantes* at 1. 18. 7 and *enumerat* at 2. 1. 44. It agrees with A against F in reading *vitta* at 1. 2. 1, *nudus* at 1. 2. 8, and *cupidus* at 1. 8. 29. Nowhere does it agree with F against A. At 2. 18. 1 it reproduces F's error, *assiduum*, against P, and does the same against both P and L in omitting *et* at 2. 15. 1. It agrees with P or L or both against F only where F has made an obvious error which the later manuscripts correct. The source from which our florilegium was derived appears, then, to have been closer to F than to L or P and closer to A than to F. Some rather tenuous evidence exists to suggest that this source may have been the manuscript which has been mentioned as the possible exemplar of A, the one which Richard de Fournival referred to around 1250 as *Propertii Aurelii Naute liber monobiblos*.³ Immediately after the Propertius-Tibullus section of the florilegium is an assortment of lines from the *Ysengrimus* headed *Secuntur Flosculi Baldwini Ceci*. This ascription of Master Nivard's famous beast epic to a Baldwin Caecus occurs, as far as is known, in only two places, and one of these is the de Fournival catalogue that contains the *incipit* associated with the A tradition of the *Elegies*.⁴ The fact that both the catalogue and the florilegium show acquaintance

with a rare ascription of a well-known work and the same textual tradition of a very obscure classical poet suggests the possibility that they may be connected and that both Richard de Fournival and

our florilegist may have had access to the same manuscript of Propertius.

PHILLIP W. DAMON

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

NOTES

1. Dorothy M. Robathan, "The Missing Folios of the Paris Florilegium 15155," *Classical Philology*, XXXIII (1938), 194. This report is corrected and amplified by P. W. Damon and W. C. Helmbold, "The Structure of Propertius, Book 2," *University of California Publications in Classical Philology*, XIV, No. 6, 242, note 5.

2. The manuscript came to the *Bibliothèque Nationale* from the library at St. Victor, and the hand makes it

at least reasonable to assume that the scribe was a Victorine.

3. See *The Elegies of Propertius*, ed. Butler and Barber (Oxford, 1933), p. lxxvii. "It (A) may, however, very well be a copy of the MS mentioned by Richard, as Ullman alternatively suggests."

4. See Max Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1931), III, 769.

A ROMAN NAVAL ROSTER: P RYLANDS 79.

P Rylands 79 is a Latin fragment, written in rustic capitals and preserved on a narrow strip of papyrus, which is incomplete on all sides. The papyrus comes from Egypt, but beyond this its provenance is unknown. It was published in 1915 by J. de M. Johnson, V. Martin, and A. S. Hunt, with the heading "List of Soldiers."¹ Its editors concluded that "its source is presumably a military register generally similar to the *pridianum* . . . published by Mommsen . . ."²

The first nine lines consist of consular dates and names, each date and name occupying a separate line. Three dates are followed by one name, the fourth by two. The consulships are those of A.D. 136, 141, 142, and 144, and come in correct chronological order. Line 10 was taken by the editors to be another name: [. . . .] *lib(ertus?) Mercur[us]*. In the remaining lines, 11-14, one finds again consular dates, each followed by a name. The consulships are those of A.D. 125 and 127.

Though the editors presented the expansion *lib(ertus)* in line 10 with some hesitation, as their question mark shows, it does not seem to have been challenged until quite recently.³ Nevertheless, in the middle of the second century a freedman would be out of place in a military register of any kind, at least in the provinces.⁴ For this reason R. O. Fink has rejected *lib(ertus)* and instead has proposed *lib(rario-*

rum) Mercur[us].⁵ Mercurium was a quarter of Alexandria.⁶

Fink explained the text as a list of *principales* similar to a Princeton papyrus which he was editing (Garrett Deposit, 7532) and *P Oslo*, 122. In the Princeton papyrus one finds the heading CORNICVLARIORVM M[ATR]ICVLA (line 16), though the second word is by no means certain.⁷ The men above this line were presumably *principales* of another kind. The Oslo text is a roster of *sesquiplicarii* (line 11), preceded by men who are almost certainly *duplicarii*. The soldiers in the first papyrus are legionaries; those in the second are from an *ala*. In both each man's name is preceded by his century or *turma* and by the date of his enlistment. The principle, if any, according to which the names are arranged under the headings is obscure; in any event it is not by date of enlistment.⁸

Fink's expansion and explanation of the Rylands papyrus do not seem to me entirely convincing. There are significant differences between it and the Princeton and Oslo texts which make it very doubtful whether they belong to the same class of documents at all. Perhaps the most serious difficulty is that for none of the men in the Rylands papyrus is his century or *turma* given. Except when a man is listed within his own century or its equivalent, it is regularly included in military

documents as an essential part of his identification, and some explanation of the absence of centuries here is certainly required. Again, the men in the Rylands papyrus are arranged in two groups, above and below line 10, according to the dates of their enlistment. But such dates, though given, do not determine the order of the *principales* in the other two texts. Their seniority presumably depended on the dates of their promotion, but however this may be, certainly not on those of their enlistment.⁹

In view of these considerations, another possible expansion *lib(urna)* seems more attractive than *lib(rariorum)*. The abbreviation is common,¹⁰ and *Mercurius* is a typical ship's name, occurring several times as the name of triremes and quadriremes in both the Misene and the Ravennate fleets.¹¹ Line 10 would then read: [*item*?] or [*item ex*?] *lib(urna) Mercur[io]*, though since it may have been indented as a heading, nothing need have preceded *lib(urna)*.

With this reading, the absence of centuries and the sequence of dates can be explained, and the character of the column preserved becomes clear. It is part of a roster of men from at least two ships.¹² Lines 1-9 conclude the list of those from one; with line 10 those from the *liburna* "Mercury" begin. A ship's crew, as is well known, constituted a *centuria* for purposes of organization and administration.¹³ The men in our text, as regularly in military documents, except for certain officers, are arranged within their *centuria* according to the dates of their enlistment.¹⁴ Thus at the end of the first group (lines 1-9), one finds those who had most recently entered service, in A.D. 136, 141, 142, and 144. Correspondingly, in lines 11-14 the first named men from the *liburna* are those who had enlisted in 125 and 127.

The nature of the text as a whole remains uncertain. One cannot determine from this fragment, for example, from how many ships men were listed. It does appear, however, that the document did not contain complete rosters of ship's

companies but only certain groups of men selected for some unknown reason. This seems to be the necessary conclusion both from the small number of those from the first ship who had enlisted between A.D. 136 and 144: five; and from the absence of officers at the head of the men from the "Mercury." The dates of enlistment should extend fairly evenly over a period of roughly twenty-six years (the regular term of service), except for losses suffered among the older men. The first group therefore may have numbered no more than approximately twelve or fifteen. In a complete roster of a *centuria* or *turma*, moreover, the centurion or decurion and usually certain other officers are named first, without regard to their dates of enlistment.¹⁵ In any event, there is nothing to suggest that these lines are part of a *pridianum*, or even of a document similar in character. In both form and purpose the *pridianum* is quite distinct from many other types of military documents which also include names.¹⁶

Fragmentary as it is, the papyrus if correctly interpreted has a certain interest in view of the rarity of texts from naval archives.¹⁷ It is evident first, as was to be expected, that in form naval documents corresponded to those of the army.¹⁸ Further, again as in the army, Latin is the language used in administration and in records, though doubtless in Egypt most sailors who were literate wrote in Greek when free to do so.¹⁹ It may also be noted that the names preserved, with one possible exception, have the Roman form of *nomen* and *cognomen*. Since the beginnings of lines are lost, one cannot tell whether any of the men also had *praenomina*.²⁰ The latest date of enlistment is 144, and the text was written probably not much later. One might combine the date in line 11, A.D. 125, and the twenty-six year term of service to obtain A.D. 151 or 152 as a date *ante quem*. But men were often retained beyond the regular term.

J. F. GILLIAM

STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

NOTES

1. *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*, II (Manchester, 1915), 40, Plate 23.

2. *Ephem. Epigr.*, VII, 456-67 = *Gesammelte Schriften*, VIII (Berlin, 1913), 553-66.

3. There is no reference to this text in F. Bilabel, *Berichtigungsliste der griechischen Papyrusurkunden aus Ägypten*, II, 2 (Heidelberg, 1933), 113-14, where corrections of P Rylands, II are collected. The expansion is accepted in F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden*, III (Berlin, 1931), 17. J. Lesquier does not include the men named in the papyrus in his prosopography of the army of Egypt or, apparently, cite it elsewhere in his *L'armée romaine d'Égypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (Cairo, 1918). For the prosopography see pp. 518-51.

4. Freedmen would still be found among the *vigiles*; see P. K. Baillie Reynolds, *The Vigiles of Imperial Rome* (Oxford, 1926), p. 67. They no longer served in the navy; C. G. Starr, Jr., *The Roman Imperial Navy 31 B.C.-A.D. 324* (Ithaca, 1941), pp. 68-70.

5. *TAPA*, LXXVI (1945), 276-77, in his article "A Fragment of a Roman Military Papyrus at Princeton," *loc. cit.*, pp. 271-78.

6. Fink evidently had in mind an assignment at granaries in the Mercurium quarter: "MERCVR[I] naturally follows from P. Lat. Gen. 1, recto, part 2, lines 5 and 23; exit ad frumentum Mercuri, which has been explained by v. Premerstein as an assignment to duty at one of the public granaries at Alexandria" (*loc. cit.*, p. 277). It is possibly worth noting that in a fragmentary aretology of Zeus Helios Serapis there is the statement: "This act of grace is registered in the libraries of Mercurium" (*P Oxy.*, 1382).

7. The one surviving letter is only partly preserved. Fink writes that it "looks superficially like X"; but it could be M or A" (*loc. cit.*, p. 272). To judge from the plate, M seems a very dubious possibility. Further, a parallel for such a use of *matricula* would be reassuring. W. Ensslin's earliest instance of *matricula* used for a military roster of any kind is in Vegetius, whom he dates in the first half of the fifth century; *RE*, XIV, 2251, s.v. "Matricula."

8. The men may have been listed according to their seniority, that is by date of promotion. If so, a phrase such as *factus cor.* and the date of promotion may have completed each entry in the Princeton text.

9. See note 8.

10. See the Index of Dessau, *ILS*, III, 1, p. 476.

11. F. Miltner, *RE*, Supplementband V, 954, s.v. "Seewesen."

12. It is possible that the document listed detachments of various kinds and that the men in lines 1-9 were drawn from a legion or auxiliary unit. But the simplest assumption is that the men were all sailors.

13. See Starr, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-58; and L. Wickert, *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*, IV (1949/50), 116 (in his valuable article, "Die Flotte der römischen Kaiserzeit," *loc. cit.*, pp. 100-125).

14. See, e.g., the documents listed by L. Amundsen, *Symbolae Osloenses*, X (1931), 27-29; and A. Calderini, *Papiri Latini* (Milan, 1945), p. 28. Amundsen describes P Rylands 79 briefly (*loc. cit.*, p. 28), remarking without further comment that the consulships are "not in chronological order."

15. See Fink, *TAPA*, LXXVIII (1947), 168.

16. In addition to *BGU* 696, first edited by Mommsen (see n. 2), a second *pridianum* was published by A. S. Hunt, *Raccolta di scritti in onore di Giacomo Lombroso: 1844-1925* (Milan, 1925), pp. 265-72. For a new edition of *BGU* 696, see R. O. Fink, *AJP*, LXIII (1942), 61-71.

17. *PSI* 1308 is probably another naval text; see *CP*, XLVII (1952), 29-31.

18. Sailors were *milites* by the second century, whatever their status at the beginning of the empire may have been. The distinctions between the Roman navy and army of course differed from those familiar in modern establishments; see Starr, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-69; Wickert, *loc. cit.*, pp. 106, 121-25, and his entire article.

19. Cf., e.g., the receipts for *cibarium* from Pselkis, which were made out by the soldiers themselves and which are in Greek; see C. Préaux, "Ostraca de Pselkis de la Bibliothèque Bodléenne," *Chronique d'Égypte*, XXVI (1951), 121-55, especially 136.

20. On the names of sailors and their significance see Starr, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-73; Wickert, *loc. cit.*, 111-13. L. F. Fitzhardinge has recently (*JRS*, XLI [1951], 19) supported Mommsen's conclusion that sailors received Latin status on enlistment against Starr. Fitzhardinge makes a number of interesting general observations about the navy in his article, "Naval Epitaphs from Misenum in the Nicholson Museum, Sydney," *loc. cit.*, pp. 17-21.

PAPAE!

After discussing the meanings of the interjection *papae*, J. B. Hofmann makes the following statement: "Außer Plaut. und Ter. bietet das Wort nur noch Hier. epist. 125, 13, 2, unsicher ob aus der lebendigen Sprache oder lediglich aus seiner Kenntnis des Terenz geschöpft"¹ — a remark which he repeats, in substance, in his revision of Walde's *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*.² And the various supplements to both works³ apparently contain no suggestion that the original statement is erroneous. Yet at least one

other example of the word (Persius 5. 79) has been known to scholars for more than two centuries.⁴ In addition, there are two examples in Boethius' *Consolatio philosophiae* — a century later than the one in Jerome — viz., 1. pr. 6 (18, 3 Weinberger): "Papae autem! Vehementer admiror cur . . ." and 4. pr. 2 (80, 27 W.): "Tum ego: Papae, inquam, ut magna promittis!"

JOHN P. COOKE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

NOTES

1. *Lateinische Umgangssprache* (2d ed.; Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1936), p. 24.

2. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1938—. Cf. his discussion *s.v.* "babae." Under "papae" itself there is merely a reference to "babae."

3. Cf. *Lat. Umgangssprache*⁸, "Nachträge" (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1936), p. 187, and the revised "Nachträge" (*ibid.*, 1951), p. 187. Cf. also *LEW*⁹, I, 851 (in the section devoted to "Nachträge und Berichtigungen").

4. Cf. Stephanus' *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, III (ed. nova; London, 1735), *s.v.* "papae." A reference to Perseus 5. 79 also appears in Hand's ed. of Tursellinus, IV (Leipzig, 1845), 387; De-Vit's ed. of Forcellini, IV (Prati, 1868), 491; Georges' *Ausführliches lateinisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch*, II (8th ed.; Hannover, 1918), 1463; Lewis and Short's *A New Latin Dictionary* (New York, 1907), *s.v.* "papae"; and Günther Saalfeld's *Tensaurus Italograecus* (Wien, 1884), p. 814.

CORRECTION OF A REFERENCE TO PHILOSTRATUS *VITA APOLLONII* 3. 16

In a discussion of epic poetry in the post-classical period, Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*⁶ (Zweiter Teil, Zweite Hälfte, Munich, 1924), page 672, state that in the third century Nestor of Laranda in Lycia composed an Ἰλιάς λειπογράμματος in each book of which one letter of the alphabet did not appear and add that Tryphiodorus later produced an *Odyssey* in which the same device was employed. A footnote (No. 12) on this passage remarks: "Ähnliche Scherze in Fulgentius De aetatibus mundi et hominis (s. V p. Chr.). Ein Brief ohne δ Philostr. vit. Ap. III 16 p. 95, 9 K. . . ." From the context the latter part of this note implies that this letter omits *delta* entirely, or, in other words, that it is a lipogram. Such is not the case for there are ten *deltas* in the letter which King Phraotes gave to Apollonius for delivery

to Iarchas, chief of the sages. It is quoted *Vit. Ap.* 2. 41 (C. L. Kayser, *Flavii Philostrati Opera* [Leipzig, 1870]). Upon the arrival of Apollonius, the sage Iarchas "greeted him in Greek and asked for the Indian's (Phraotes') letter. When Apollonius showed wonder and amazement at his prescience, Iarchas added that one letter, a *delta*, was missing, . . . καὶ γράμμα γε ἐν ἔφῃ λείπειν τῆ ἐπιστολῆ, δέλτα εἰπών, . . . (3. 16) for it had escaped the notice of the writer. And this was found to be so." The sense of the first few lines of the letter appears to demand δ before οὔν, *i.e.*, δ'οὔν in the third line — the missing *delta*. For a discussion of the use of δ'οὔν see J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1934), pages 460-68.

PAUL G. MOORHEAD

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

BOOK REVIEWS

The Nature of Roman Comedy: A Study in Popular Entertainment. By GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1952. Pp. xvi+501+8 pls. \$7.50.

Wide reading, accuracy, common sense and conspicuous fairness characterize this authoritative survey by the editor of the *Epidicus* and of *The Complete Roman Drama*. The scholars in many lands whose names appear in the eighteen pages of bibliography may well feel that they have been brought together by an admirable host, who often subordinates his own views in his desire to do justice to others. In lucid and thoroughly documented chapters he deals with the early Italian popular comedy, with Greek comedy, Latin drama, its presentation and staging, theme and treatment, composition, thought, comic spirit, language and meter, and the influence of the Latin plays upon subsequent comedy, particularly in England. There is a brief account of the manuscripts and main editions, and the book concludes with an index of thirty-five pages.

A different climate of opinion will be found here from that prevailing fifty or even twenty-five years ago, and the change has been largely due to American scholars, whose painstaking researches, not always recognized abroad, in widely separate parts of the field, have substituted realistic study for the sweeping assumptions and dogmatic pronouncements of earlier years. Hypothesis has followed hypothesis into at least temporary discredit; the present tendency is "to compare the known with the known" (p. 388) in accordance with the excellent advice given in 1919 by H. W. Prescott "disregarding all theories, to analyze these plays." Nevertheless scholarly research cannot forego hypotheses altogether, and (as Duck-

worth recognizes) not only does the pendulum swing, but new theories must be expected and (if possible) turned to account. Already the class-warfare hypothesis has reared its head, and is here dealt with firmly, yet fairly. One of Duckworth's most engaging qualities is his readiness to consider the case for a theory with which he does not agree.

The variety of Latin drama is made eminently clear. Facile generalizations are shown to need qualification; there is suspense in Plautus, there is irony in Terence. Some principle of classification is clearly desirable in dealing with twenty-six plays; Duckworth finds his in the use made of error. Thus there are comedies turning upon innocent mistakes, comedies of trickery, comedies which combine trickery and innocent mistakes, and comedies in which the element of error is comparatively unimportant and which aim mainly at the portrayal of character (*Aulularia* and *Adelphoe*) and customs (*Stichus*, *Trinummus*, *Truculentus*). But the very attempt to be scientific seems to import an alien element into the turbulent world of Plautine comedy. I note with approval the stress laid on off-stage action (p. 130); here, I think, Plautus was careful; but I am not so convinced by the statement (p. 225) that Plautus "uses the comic delay to increase the dramatic tension" in such scenes as *As.* 267ff., where a slave hurrying in with news will take part in a long scene of comic monologue or dialogue before he delivers his message. What Duckworth here attributes to design I would sometimes refer to high spirits and the lure of present laughter — in fact *neclegentia*; and indeed on page 190 we read that "the spectators doubtless never realized that the scenes were irrelevant." With Terence, on the other hand, I seem to be continually conscious of a dramatic

intention. Perhaps the case for Terence's development as an artist is put too confidently; on page 186 we read: "the other five plays reveal an ever increasing mastery of the dual plot." This is a rather high claim both for the originality of Terence and for our knowledge of the chronology of his plays; contrast the argument on page 61 that "the superior artistry of the *Adelphoe* makes it most probably the last of Terence's comedies."

This is a literary study; the help of archaeology (such as it is) is scarcely enlisted, and the much-desired synthesis between the evidence of literature and of art is still unachieved. Interesting as are the eight illustrations taken from manuscripts of Terence, Duckworth himself points out their unreliability as evidence for stage usage (p. 88). I agree with him in rejecting the use of a window (p. 95), but action on the roof seems certain in the *Amphitruo* (1008), as well as in several Greek plays. I have noticed two minor misprints: *the* for *that* (p. 180, l. 19) and *is* for *in* (p. 370, n. 21); while on page 198, line 28, I would venture to substitute *certain* for *improbable*.

In a subject which has suffered from prejudice, narrowness of outlook and mental confusion, Duckworth's candor, moderation and good sense deserve some tribute. I believe that in his own thinking there are still some unresolved contradictions; and in particular I invite him to define what he means by "song" in ancient drama and to justify his use of the term in the sense of his definition. With the main ideas of the book I am heartily in agreement; it is the most comprehensive treatment of the subject which I know, and I have read it with real pleasure.

W. BEARE

University of Bristol

The Imagery of Sophocles' Antigone: A Study of Poetic Language and Structure.
By ROBERT F. GOHEEN. Princeton:
Princeton University Press, 1951. Pp.
171. \$ 3.00.

There are signs recently of interesting developments in the study of Sophocles. The year 1951 alone saw the appearance of three original and challenging books on the subject. There was C. H. Whitman's *Sophocles* from Harvard, in which the dramatist appears with neither the lineaments of "an enlightened bishop," nor the cold contours of a fifth-century statue. From Sydney came *Sophocles the Dramatist* by the late Challis Professor of English Literature, A. J. A. Waldock, a book quite refreshing in its freedom from tradition. From Princeton came Robert F. Goheen's detailed study of the imagery of the *Antigone*.

The author was wise to confine his investigation to the language of one play. His book is an essay in the primary meaning of the word. It tests and tries out a new approach, and the author, no doubt, has worked in expectation of constructive comment, and in the hope that the possibility of applying his method more widely may be generally conceded. C. Day Lewis, quoted by Goheen, remarks: "... the principle that organises images is a concord between the image and the theme, the image lighting the way for the theme and helping to reveal it, step-by-step, ... and the theme as it grows controlling more and more the development of the images. If verse is still the best medium for the poetic image, it is because the whole mode of verse, by its formal limitations and its repetitiveness, can create a greater intensity within the image patterns — clearer echoes, more complex relationships." As Aristotle said in one of those remarks which so often pacify the very natural impatience of the reader of the *Poetics*: "Under the category of thought is included every effect which has to be produced by speech." Hence the deep relevance of imagery in the study of characterization, and in the more fundamental search for the author's meaning. Goheen's thesis applies C. Day Lewis and Aristotle to the Sophoclean play. He sets out to demonstrate that "the placing of the dramatic conflict within the question

of man's place in the universe and within the existence of a final tragic order of things," is accomplished "by various features in the imagery, especially in the animal, disease, and sea sequences which run through the play, while at the same time these and other recurrent images work to develop the motives and attitudes which mark the chief agents of the plot" (pp. 75-76).

Such is the theme of the study as far as a representative quotation, lifted from its context, can be fairly claimed to state it in the author's own words. And it may be forthwith conceded that Mr. Goheen has sustained his thesis. The imagery is quite clearly a key to the characterization, and a pointer in the outworking of the plot. Consider Creon. It is shown convincingly that the tyrant's language marks with clarity both his view of humanity and of himself. Like Pentheus in the *Bacchae* he is a man of simple ideas, confident that nothing complicated or more remote lies behind phenomena, and quite certain that all who disagree do so from base and materialistic motives. He is full of "common sense," and like St. Paul's "natural man," understands nothing which is "spiritually discerned." Hence his imagery. In something like one hundred lines (221-326) he employs at least six or seven figures of money and merchandising against those who have stirred his anger. It is money, money, money, which is behind all opposition. And damningly, as if to mark his obsession, the metaphor regains control in the menacing scene with Teiresias, as the play mounts to its catastrophe.

The military metaphors are equally illuminating. It was natural enough that the captain of the host, after a night under arms, should find his thinking interwoven with the language of the camp. It is possible to trace the progress of Creon's *hubris* through this image sequence alone. The metaphor is at first unobtrusive (e.g., ll. 168, 215, 217). It becomes more dominant, and reaches its climax of revelation in the "Freudian slip" (Goheen's phrase)

of lines 666, 667. Then, like the images of the money-merchandising sequence, the military language interlaces the recognition passage, and marks the turning of the peripety.

The same contradiction of imagery can be traced in the animal-control sequence. Such artistry can hardly be a chance phenomenon. It appears to be a conscious device of great poets. Euripides, for example, uses the image of a ship three times at vital points in the *Hercules Furens*. First it tows its boats (ll. 632, 633); then it is moored firmly with hawsers (l. 1094); finally (l. 1424), at the play's end, it is a wreck in tow. The image underlines the pathological unity of the play. Similarly Sophocles, on Goheen's illustration, appears to have used three image-sequences, first to mark the development of the tragic situation, and then to suggest a reason for the catastrophe.

These comments have been confined in large measure to Creon, but the study under review is quite as suggestive in its treatment of Antigone. Another by-product of the investigation is, in fact, a novel defense of the strange sophistry of lines 909-15. Goheen maintains that "a strongly emotional and somewhat illogical method of argument marks her (Antigone's) two terminal statements of final principle, and it is surely above accident that this occurs thus in her first and her final appearances in the play." The relevant passages are lines 72-77 and 909-15. It is quite true that "something is strange in the reasoning when *duration* of time to be spent in the underworld proves the value of an act or may be thought to demonstrate its relation to the laws of the gods." And this is legitimately set side-by-side with "the more obvious illogic" of the second passage. Whether Herodotus or Bowra's "primitive argument derived from folklore or the market-place" inspires such odd sophistry, the fact remains that Antigone is speaking, and Sophocles was less likely than Euripides to lift a character from its psychological context in order to use it briefly as a vehicle for alien ideas. If an Antigone

significantly different from the traditional Sophoclean heroine emerges from the examination, perhaps the value of such linguistic study stands demonstrated in the fact. If Goheen's point is granted, the portrait of Antigone acquires a curiously Euripidean touch.

It should be pointed out in conclusion that there are dangers in the method of this study. Goheen has worked with care and reserve and is, in general, quite convincing. Over-subtlety is the temptation, and a first reading of the comments on Stasimon II arouses the suspicion that one instance is here. It may, however, be admitted that a re-reading of the ode, and further examination of Goheen's elaborate analysis, does much to win agreement. For all the current re-examination of Sophocles' credentials, it is unlikely that he will ever be regarded as anything less than a great lyric poet, as well as a dramatist of the first order. Grant this, and much of Goheen's argument, here as elsewhere, follows. On all counts his pioneering has opened up a fertile territory.

E. M. BLAIKLOCK

University College,
Auckland, New Zealand

Aesopica: A Series of Texts Relating to Aesop or Ascribed to him or Closely Connected with the Literary Tradition that Bears his Name, Vol. I: *Greek and Latin Texts*. Edited and Translated by BEN EDWIN PERRY. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952. Pp. xxvi + 765. \$15.00 (cloth).

It is a rare privilege to welcome such an imposing product of American classical scholarship — 765 pages of Greek and Latin texts, Latin Introduction, and Indexes; and this is only the first of three or four volumes; the others will be devoted to commentaries, Armenian, Arabic and other Oriental variants of the Fables, etc. We shall eventually have an edition superseding Halm, Chambry, Hausrath, Herveux and all the rest.

The contents are engrossing: a careful

study of the manuscripts and their recensions and interplay; the Life of Aesop, from the famous Morgan Library manuscript and the Westermann manuscript, with the hitherto unpublished Latin *Life*, from the Belluno manuscript; the testimonia of ancient writers; the Aesopic *Sententiae* and *Proverbia* (also first publications); 471 Fables in the Greek text, meticulously edited, plus the Syntipas *sylloge*; and then the Latin versions (157 pp.) and 49 pages of Indexes.

Here are the originals of the fables of La Fontaine which we learned by heart in school; familiar proverbs like "Get friends, not things," "The serpent sheds its skin, never its wisdom"; stories amusing and scandalous of the slave Aesop and his dull and brutal master; the Latin *Life*, by the way, is in interesting medieval Latin.

This volume should be a "must" for everyone giving a course in Comparative Literature; but as these gentlemen are in general ignorant of Greek and at best shaky in Latin, it might be wise for Professor Perry to set one of his pupils at an abridged edition in English.

It remains only to say that the printing of this volume is superb (an \$8000 grant from the Bollingen Foundation made this possible) and that the frightfully difficult proofreading has been practically perfect. Professor Perry may well be proud of this first-fruit of his devotion of over twenty years, suitably seconded by the Illinois University Press and the Beverly Press of Baltimore.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK

North Hatley, Quebec

L'Ordre des mots dans la phrase latine, Tome III: *Les articulations de l'énoncé*.

By J. MAROUZEAU. ("Collection d'études latines," série scientifique, Vol. XXIV.) Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1949. Pp. 200.

The first volume of this series, concerning *Les groupes nominaux*, appeared in 1922; the second, *Le verbe*, appeared in 1938. The present volume is the final one.

The subject of the order of words in Latin is an important and difficult one. Marouzeau in the present volume occasionally adds some light on the problems involved, as in his discussion of such phrases as *aegro cum corde* (pp. 57-63), and in his treatment of the post-position of relatives and conjunctions (pp. 121-35). But the attempt to cover all ancient Latin, excessive for such modest volumes, leads inevitably to superficial treatment. Furthermore, Marouzeau (pp. 141, 180, 192) denies that mere initial or final position carries emphasis, preferring the principles of relationship, especially disjunction and reversal of normal order. Though it is quite correct to say that not every sentence exhibits deliberate emphasis in initial or final positions, it seems to the reviewer that generally emphasis in initial or final position is undeniable, and that the contrary assumption automatically excludes one of the most interesting aspects of the problem: the interrelation of initial or final position and relative (syntactical) position. This aspect is complicated in Plautus, from whom a considerable percentage of Marouzeau's examples are drawn, by the fact that initial and final positions in the verse are treated in many respects like initial and final positions in sentences — an important principle that Marouzeau nowhere notices.¹

Marouzeau (pp. 194-95) points out that notions of logical order and grammatical order are deceptive. So they are, and notions of emphasis, also, often seem subjective. Thus Marouzeau (p. 196) seems to think that *sero* is the important word in Plautus *Aulularia* 249: *idem, quando occasio illaec perivit, post sero cupit*. He points out that nothing in the *forme de l'énoncé* here advises us of its importance. Now the reviewer submits that the proper emphasis — not much is needed, because the trend of the meaning here is unmistakably obvious — is given by the use of both *post* and *sero* (cf. *Cap.* 870). Again, Marouzeau

(p. 22) intimates that the word *agam* controls the order of the parenthetical phrase *non agam obscure* (Cicero *Cat.* 1. 8). But *agam* here is weak²; *non . . . obscure* are the emphatic words. Often in such parentheses in Cicero, the most important word occurs final (cf. *Cat.* 2. 18; 4. 11). Still again, in his effort to discount Wackernagel's view of the unimportance of the second position, Marouzeau (p. 68) cites *sum* in the following line (*Ru.* 883) as an emphatic word: *:: hospes— :: non sum hospes, repudio hospitium tuom*. But there is no logical reason whatever to assume that *sum* here is emphatic; indeed all logic is against this, and here meter (*sum* is elided) reinforces logic.

Marouzeau (p. 133) says that in the following lines (*Men.* 856-57) *ad me* is *aussi bien en relief* as *me quidem*: *:: dabitur malum, / me quidem si attigeris aut si propius ad me accesseris*. This, of course, is incorrect, and violates a basic and most important principle for any study of style: an idea once firmly established with the aid of emphatic position or otherwise does not in subsequent references call for emphatic expression. Very frequently in Plautus subsequent references are unemphatic and subject, as here, to elision (cf. *Tri.* 472-75).

Here and in other instances, Marouzeau gives the impression of treating Plautine verse as prose. In one short paragraph (p. 184), he does remark the tendency to place iambic words final in iambic and trochaic verse; but in his general conclusions (p. 196), he warns against citing metrical convenience except with extreme precaution. Precaution, of course, is needed; but omission of well-established fact utterly vitiates his study as far as the early dramatists are concerned. There are many other tendencies of dialogue verse as important as this one, and also many laws that are absolute, or nearly so. Thus in his first volume (I, 201) Marouzeau remarks the repeated disjunction of *quindecim . . . minas* without mentioning the

1. Cf. Franz Skutsch, *Forschungen . . . I Plautinisches und Romaniaches* (Leipzig, 1892), 57; Hans Drexler, *Plautinische Akzentstudien* (Breslau, 1932), I, 7, 245, and *passim*.

2. Compare *palam age*, Plautus *Ru.* 1404, in which the initial position of the adverb suggests its importance.

fact that a cretic and iambic word are never juxtaposed at the ends of lines in dialogue verse (Luchs' Law; the few exceptions tend to strengthen the law rather than disprove it) and rarely within lines. Anyone who has closely examined Plautine verse with regard to the positions of words of given types knows immediately that *minas*, or any such iambic word not subject to elision, synizesis, etc., will be disjoined from a cretic word, just as in the vast majority of cases it will immediately follow a molossic word such as *viginti*.

Likewise, Marouzeau (p. 27) offers an explanation for the position of the superlative adverb *planissime* in *Epidicus* 510 and *Phormio* 686 (both *senarii*) with no regard for the fact that this word in its nine occurrences in Plautus and Terence always stands final in the verse with two exceptions (*Tru.* 548 and *Ph.* 771), where, in *septenarii*, it is elided. The metrician knows from experience that in *senarii* polysyllabic words ending with a cretic usually stand final.

A more subtle case of metrical influence may be found in the phrase *uidisse numquam* initial in *senarii* (*Au.* 61). Marouzeau (pp. 31-32) is inclined here to find a delicate reflection of popular expressiveness in the post-position of the adverb. He mentions no metrical consideration whatever, and we know from the Introduction to his edition of Terence (p. 59) that he would give no weight to the clash of ictus and accent that would result in the order *numquam uidisse*. But regardless of possible explanations, the facts of usage cannot be ignored. *Numquam* often precedes with *uidi* and seems to be just as emphatic as it is in *Aulularia* 61 (cf. *Men.* 1088, *Ps.* 136 [both trochaic]; *Mo.* 533, *Ps.* 1018 [both *senarii*, and *numquam* is disjoined and elided in both]). Looking at the matter in another way, the reviewer has counted some forty-three cases of reverse bacchiac and spondaic words (including *uidisse credo*, *Mer.* 706 — note the order) initial in all the *senarii* of Plautus (fragments omitted), but only thirteen cases of the reverse order (of which one concerns an

oxytone word [*Pe.* 722, *attat*] and various other cases seem dominated by formulaic order [e.g., *Au.* 692] or other considerations of grammar or style). In short, Plautus prefers the order which places the reverse bacchiac first by a ratio of three to one, and such preference cannot safely be ignored in any study of style.

Marouzeau (pp. 116-17) is quite at loss to explain why Plautus at one time writes *quid ego igitur cesso* (*Pe.* 742) and at another *quid igitur ego dubito* (*Am.* 409), or again, *ibo intro igitur* (*Mo.* 849) and *ibo igitur intro* (*Mi.* 1121). The metrician can explain these usages very readily. The phrase *quid igitur* would be an impossible proceleusmatic in iambic verse (*Pe.* 742), though only a metrician who believes in ictus and accent can explain why (no ictus on penult of a tribrach word), since *quid ego igi-* is quite possible. But in trochaic verse *quid igitur ego* causes no difficulty (*Am.* 409). Likewise, *ibo intro igitur* is normal at the beginning of a trochaic verse (*Mo.* 849), but in iambic verse initial, it would result in the ictus falling on an anapestic word in the second foot, which for some reason — known only to metricians who believe in ictus and accent — Plautus abhors.³ So Plautus used *ibo igitur intro* initial in iambic verse (*Mi.* 1121), thus — incidentally — coming out with the usual penthemimeral caesura.⁴ We see here again that any study of style in Plautus is meaningless when metrics are ignored.

In considering cases of the post-position of an adverb, Marouzeau (p. 22) lists as a regular category formulae of well-wishing or cursing, and cites from Terence *di uorant bene* (*Eu.* 390, *Hec.* 196). It is true that this order occurs a few times at the ends of lines in Plautus and especially in

3. Oscar Brugman (*Quemadmodum in iambico senario Romani veteres verborum accentus cum numeris constarint* [Bonn, 1874], p. 35) lists 17 cases of anapestic words in the second foot in all the *senarii* (over 8,000) in Plautus.

4. The caesura, of course, is not an incidental consideration. Nevertheless, Plautus' divergences from Menandrian usage in the word-structure of the second and third feet in *senarii* are demonstrably not caused by a greater regard for caesura. Cf. Drexler in *Gnomon*, XXIII (1951), 169.

Terence; but of course the normal order of the formula in Plautus is *di bene uortant*. This fact seems to indicate that Marouzeau is mistaken in forming such a category: the adverb normally, it seems, precedes.

That the style of lyric passages in Plautus differs from that of the dialogue verse has been demonstrated by Haffter and others. Yet Marouzeau (p. 43) without mentioning the lyric nature of the line assumes that the disjunction of the preposition in the following verse (*Cas.* 815) reproduces a ritualistic formula: *sensim super attolle limen pedes, mea noua nupta*. One would have expected alliteration, also, to have been taken into account here. From the manner in which this case of disjunction is cited, one might conclude that it could not be paralleled in Plautus; Marouzeau could have cited also fragment 45-46 (Lindsay). Again, Marouzeau (p. 59) includes *Epidicus* 681, *oculis concessi tuis*, among cases of disjunction involving prepositions. This error seems to be the result of originally reading with various editors *oculis concessi a tuis*, and then striking out the inserted preposition but leaving the phrase in this category.

Marouzeau (p. 74) classifies Lucretius 4. 1010 (not 5. 1010, as he has it) as a case of a strange construction in which *-que* is attached to a word different from that which it introduces: *edere sunt persectantes visaeque volantes*. The editors of Lucretius, also, go astray on this verse and are not unanimous in their decisions about which word the connective really belongs to! Actually, of course, it belongs to the one to which it is attached: we are dealing here with the construction ἀπὸ κοινού. This is quite clear from such examples as Ennius *scen.* 243 (cf. Vahlen on 242f.): *cum capra aut nepa aut exoritur nomen aliquod beluarum*, or Plautus *Mo.* 414^b: *tranquille cuncta et ut proueniant sine malo*, or Vergil *Aen.* 6. 255-57 (cf. Norden on 256ff.):

ecce autem primi sub limina solis et ortus,
sub pedibus mugire solum, et iuga coepta
moveri

5. Cf. J. B. Hofmann in Stolz-Schmalz, *Lat. Gram.*⁵, p. 848.

silvarum, visaeque canes ululare per umbram,

The position of *sunt* in the line of Lucretius makes his usage less ordinary, but the construction — one of the most characteristic in Latin — is still unmistakable.

Marouzeau (pp. 88-89) finds various anomalies in the position of *autem*. But especially in Early Latin, this word can be interpreted properly only if one keeps constantly in mind the uses of the Greek cognates. Thus it is quite beside the point for Marouzeau to note that in the following cases a group of words is repeated: *uehit hic clitellas, uehit hic autem alter . . .* (*Mo.* 778), *puero opust cibo, opus est matri autem . . .* (*Tru.* 902). The usages here are parallel to those in Aeschylus *Eumenides* 954 and *Iliad* 11. 108-9. Similarly in the following line, *hic* (the adverb) is the important word, and *autem* is therefore in its proper position (*Tru.* 335): *sed quid haec hic autem tam diu ante aedis stetit?*

PHILIP WHALEY HARSH

Stanford University

Excavations at Olynthus, Part XIII: Vases Found in 1934 and 1938. By DAVID M. ROBINSON. ("The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology," ed. DAVID M. ROBINSON, No. 38.) Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege (Oxford University Press), 1950. Pp. xx+463+267 pls. + frontispiece. \$25.00.

These "vases found in 1934 and 1938" include the finds then made at Mecyberna, as well as the pottery from the main excavation at Olynthus; for still fuller measure Professor Robinson has put in a few pieces from Thracian sites not dug by himself. The most welcome of these guests is a remarkable fragment at Saloniki from Mesembria, part of a plate by the Heidelberg Painter (pl. 29).

This is a book easy to praise. But to do it exact justice is not easy for a reviewer, who has the duty of exerting himself to extenuate the blemishes of a work which

is very important (if not very attractive) in its material, which teems with fresh learning well applied, which moreover is something splendidly generous — in its bulk and sumptuous completeness one more offering of the personal munificence of a man truly great in his patronage, as well as in his practice, of Archaeology. Of certain petulances in the Preface and in the section where Professor Robinson himself reviews the reception of some earlier volumes, the less here said the better; extenuation is scarcely possible; we can only tell him bluntly that from a giant of his stature we expect magnanimity. On the other hand, it is imperative to counteract one antagonizing impression which, unfairly for the author, this book is likely to make upon the reader. From the almost too passionate precision of his conservative dating of the latest vases it might be gathered that Professor Robinson has let the question of Olynthus' survival become a bogey, to be bravely ignored or strenuously exorcized. "From the graves (not to mention reoccupied "NEOSH") is there no sliver of pottery that Professor Robinson would allow to be *conceivably* later than 348?" It needs, therefore, to be said that nothing could be more moderate and candid than Professor Robinson's published stand (*Olynthus*, VIII, 9, *RE*, XVIII (1939), 529) on the question of survival; he has further guarded himself in *Olynthus*, XII, 309 (admitting evidences of reoccupation on the Southern, not merely the Northern, hill). No doubt, this volume would have been a little different if Professor Robinson had felt (as he was entitled to feel) that the importance of his site, as an instrument of precision for the dating of pottery, gained rather than lost by our need to admit that utter desolation, absolute and perpetual desolation as of a religious taboo, never befell it. Then, I think, we should have had from him, if not a more guarded chronology of the funerary pottery, at any rate a fuller, clearer, account of the ceramic yield of that part of the South hill ("NEOSH") where *Olynthus*, XII, indicated two layers

of stratification (p. 309). This seemed to promise a very finely exact determination of the latest phases of the pottery. But apart from the two red-figured kraters published on plates 37 and 38, with a somewhat baffling account of their provenience and probable date on pages 28, 82-86, Professor Robinson has not a sherd to show from this area.

But what most needs to be said is that the plates of the fifth and thirteenth volumes of *Excavations at Olynthus* amount to triumphant proof of Professor Robinson's contention that what he has discovered is not a Hellenistic city. No one who takes the trouble to control the material by comparison with Breccia's *La nécropole de Sciatbi* can fail to see that in techniques and shapes the Chatby pottery carries on from just where the Olynthus chain breaks off; still less is there any significant overlap between the Olynthus pottery and the earliest phase of Thompson's series from Athens ("Two Centuries of Hellenistic Pottery" in *Hesperia*, III [1934], 311ff.).

There is good work in Professor Robinson's connoisseurship of the figured vases: sound attributions to the Deepdene Painter (pls. 33-35), the Painter of London E 325 (pl. 61), the Filottrano Group (pl. 132). To note these certainties is not tacit rejection of some other attributions less immediately convincing. But I do not expect to join him in giving the feeble lekythos of plate 95 to that masterly sketcher, the Bowdoin Painter, and I am perfectly sure Professor Robinson does not really mean what his printer has said for him (p. 12) about fragments 198 A, B, D, E, F (pl. 116) "which remind one a little of the Brygos Painter and date before 475 B.C." Apart from 198 D, are any of these even archaic? 198 A seems to be from a fourth-century pelike (Hercules and Nessus?). I believe Professor Robinson to be right in judging the Panathenaic amphora from the house of Dionysius (pls. 14-16) to be "akin to the Kuban Group." Did the magnificent fragment of black-figure from Mesembria (pl. 29) be-

long to a plate, as Professor Robinson believes, or to a cup? The accessory ornament (recalling unpublished plates in Leyden) supports the designation which he prefers: but one would have welcomed some description of the back of the fragment. Anyhow, as Mrs. Pauline Armstrong also has seen, it is certainly by a master of cups, the Heidelberg Painter.

Very interesting is Professor Robinson's success in detecting, among the fragments of late red-figure, some that are not Attic but local imitations, betrayed by their clay: the hydria No. 42 (pl. 57), and the pelike No. 51 (pl. 66). To their respective painters he rightly attributes Nos. 156 and 285 of his fifth volume. On page 16 the fragment 198 F (pl. 116) is hailed as Olynthian, but that must be a mere slip if the grouping indicated for it on page 174 is seriously meant (Heidelberg 232, which Professor Robinson attributes to this master "represented only at Olynthus," was found on the West slope of the Akropolis of Athens).

This publication can be reckoned a great achievement without stressing the difficulties overcome in it. But these were serious, especially certain setbacks resulting from the very steps taken to protect the Saloniki collections during the war. The damage which Professor Robinson had to repair upon the second excavation of these vases was indeed not altogether to the bad, for it enabled him to improve on the work of his original menders. One piece seems to have escaped improvement, the kalyx-krater of pls. 33-35 (described on pp. 75-76). It needs to be taken to pieces and reset. The Nike was not "hurrying to the right, with left foot advanced"; she was stationary, and the fragments pieced in for her skirt and feet do not belong to her, but to the pursued woman of the reverse picture; to her pursuer belongs the booted leg which Professor Robinson takes for part of a lost Amazon. Moreover, for proper relation to the scenes the horizontal axis of the handles requires to be shifted about a quarter turn to the right. This gives: (A) Nike standing to pour wine

for a warrior; (B) Old man, to the right of whom is a youth pursuing a woman.

In conclusion, it must be said that while the figured pottery is of interest (especially to scholars at work on the map of fourth century r. f.), the main and arresting importance of this volume is in its conscientious presentation of the plainer wares. It is this that gives the book its inestimable value for the fieldworker.

H. R. W. SMITH

University of California

Classics in Translation, Vol. I: *Greek Literature*; Vol. II: *Latin Literature*. Edited by PAUL MACKENDRICK and HERBERT M. HOWE. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1952. Pp. xiv + 426; xiv + 436. \$5.00 each; \$9.00 set.

The authors presented in the first of these two volumes extend from Homer to Lucian; those in the second, from Plautus to Suetonius. Some works from each literature occur in complete translation, some in abridged versions, and some in selections. Page iii of each volume lists the material of the set: the translated texts themselves (with indication of the degree of completeness), "introductory essays, explanatory notes." But this page, for which the publishers may be responsible rather than the editors, misstates things in calling Seneca's *Medea* and Juvenal's sixth *Satire* complete. Actually, though it is not mentioned in the introductory essay, vss. 617-67 of the *Medea* are merely summarized. The Juvenal, however, is called "Selections" both in the Table of Contents for Volume II and where the text begins (II, 415) and described as "almost entire" by the translator in his Introduction. (The parts omitted include the *Additamenta Bodeiana*.) Volume I opens with an essay on Greek culture by W. R. Agard; Volume II, with one on Roman culture by MacKendrick.

The general Preface to the set contains the following remark: "for once the editors have the perfect retort for reviewers; if

they dislike the choice or the style of the selections, they are hereby cordially invited to contribute different, better translations to the second edition." But the editors' retort suggests certain questions. As they explain, most of the renderings were done "especially for this book." Might not some contributors then have been induced to make a different choice? Might we not have had a somewhat different collection of versions from Cicero's speeches, for instance — but by the same translator, who has a real flair for preserving periodic structure? A few of the translations used are reprints — e.g., MacNeice's *Agamemnon* and the imitations of Catullus by E. A. Havelock. So one wonders whether others could not have been found, despite the problem of obtaining permission to reprint. Therefore, while realizing how difficult the task of any anthologist is, I make bold to comment on "the choice" — and even "the style of the selections," for often only a few minor stylistic points need revision.

Some of the excerpts seem exactly right for the space available. This is so in the case of Thucydides; we have the preface and the "Archaeology," Pericles' funeral oration and the plague, the *stasis* in Corcyra and throughout the Greek world, the Melian dialogue, and the Athenian defeat in Sicily. If several works appear in snippets, it is cause for rejoicing that the last six books of the *Aeneid* have not been skimmed. Certain omissions come as a shock. For example, though selections from Cicero's *Pro Cluentio* with its hair-raising tale of crime and scandal are rightly included, it is regrettable that the *Catilinarians* and the *Pro Archia* have been passed over. These may have become boring to teachers, they may have been omitted through the editors' zest for something new and fresh, but certain things which have persisted in the classical curriculum belong to the classics-in-translation course. Another case in point is Juvenal; only the sixth *Satire* is represented. Now this one unfortunately is too often neglected in the classroom. But certainly

the third and the tenth are a better first dose of Juvenal, and Dr. Johnson has enhanced their importance for the English-speaking student. (It should be noted that in many of the introductions, though not in the one to Juvenal, the influence of the author in question is taken up briefly; the account of the influence of Seneca's tragedies in general and of the *Medea* in particular is an interesting one succinctly done.)

It must have been hard to decide what dramas to include. One of the determining factors was the praiseworthy desire to juxtapose Greek and Latin works; hence we have Euripides' *Medea* and Seneca's — along with Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, the *Antigone*, the *Frogs*, the *Mostellaria*, and the *Andria*. In fact, there is much careful interweaving of the Greek and Roman strands of classical civilization in the volumes. Similarities and differences between the two cultures and the indebtedness of Rome to Greece are frequently pointed out in introductions and notes. For instance, cross-references help the reader to collate the Old Oligarch's remarks on the aristocrats with Cicero's in the *Pro Sestio*; the essay introducing the *Andria* gives apposite information about Menander.

Inevitably, the prose authors have proved easier than the poets to turn into English. But many of the translations from verse read well; I would cite especially the *Hymn to Hermes* (in prose), the *Antigone* (in verse), Euripides' *Medea* (the dialogue in prose, the choral odes in verse), Lucretius ("in rhythmical lines of irregular length"), and the extracts from Virgil's *First Georgic* (in verse). Winspear's Lucretius is more pleasing rhythmically than Humphries' *Aeneid* (in "a loose iambic pentameter"). But each of these versions reveals a tiresome structural device. Winspear delights in omitting the article: e.g., "Since soul is held to be of mortal stuff" (II, 70); "And loiter after lady of the streets" (73); "But from the lovely face, complexion fair, of loved one" (74). Humphries revels in substantives hanging in

mid-air: e.g., "Night; and tired creatures over all the world / Were seeking slumber ..." (II, 229) for *Nox erat ...* (*Aen.* 4. 522f.); "Shore against shore, wave against wave, and war, / War after war for all the generations" (230) rendering *litora litoribus ... / imprecor ... pugnent ipsique nepotesque* (*Aen.* 4. 628-29). Despite this mannerism, Humphries is fairly successful in a most difficult task; for, ultimately, Virgil is untranslatable. Humphries states the problem apropos of the description of the harbor, contrasting with that of the storm, in *Aen.* 1: "The English can barely hint what the Latin brings out." As for Horace's *Odes*, it is a surprise to find that most of the versions are Harvard undergraduate prize translations. The editors' approach seems a bit parochial here, though they have sensibly preferred Leon's *Mostellaria* to the Harvard undergraduate one done by Jarcho and Bassett (now in Duckworth's *Complete Roman Drama*).

There are occasional unidiomatic elements and inappropriate colloquialisms throughout the work. "I and these men" (I, 65), "between me and Torquatus" (II, 165), and "of me and Triarius" (166) sound strange in English; and the original of the last of these phrases is actually the Latin *ego et regina mea* type. "Dove" instead of "dived" is objectionable in versions of the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid* (I, 56; II, 224). "To stand the gaff," found twice in the selections from Quintilian, is really too slangy for that "mandarin," as the translator aptly calls him.

A few inelegancies and grammatical errors should be noted. Four *about's* piled on one another in two successive sentences (I, 354) — and in the Introduction to Aristotle, not the translation — are unpleasant. *Or* is preferable to *nor* in "we are not permitted to share either in ... nor in ..." (II, 295), but this may be one of the rather numerous misprints¹ that occur.

1. Among the more noteworthy ones (those involving punctuation or accents are entirely omitted) are the following: *Vol. I, p. 24.* — for "Lycæon's glorious sun" read "L. g. son." *P. 120.* — for "appear to nothing" read "a. t. be n." *P. 151.* — for "You like in that spider's web" read "Y. lie i. t. s. w." *P. 171.* — for "of if" read "or if."

The following are solecisms: "on you, O... goddess, Hecate, who gives ..." (II, 311); "Orpheus ... beguiled the mermaid to follow him, she who had stayed ..." (315).

The text which a given translator has followed is noted at the end of each introductory essay, and one is puzzled by the many old editions used. For instance, the version of Plutarch's *Life of Tiberius Gracchus* is based on Sintenis' text, not the new one by Ziegler (1915). The translation of Quintilian follows the text "of E. Bonnell (Leipzig: Teubner, 1869-72, 2 vols.)." But there have been Teubner editions by both Halm and Radermacher since Bonnell. Furthermore, Bonnell's text came out in 1854 (1869-72 being the date of a reprint). Similarly, a 1921 text of Seneca's tragedies by Peiper and Richter can only be a reprint of their second edition (1902).

In general, the introductory essays give a good exposition of an author's life, writings, and significance. The style is described every now and then², and the problem of reproducing this in English often commented on. The introductions to Sallust and Petronius are extremely good. In the one to Pliny the Younger it should have been stated that his letters were doubtless composed with publication in mind; also, since the volumes have no selections from the correspondence of Cicero (or Seneca's *Epistulae Morales*), some discussion of letter-writing as a typically Roman genre would have been in order.

P. 240. — for "tolerance on one" read "t. of o." *P. 248.* — for "you think one of your points" read "y. t. o. o. our p." *Vol. II, p. 38.* — for "1936" read "1926" (publication date of the Kauer-Lindsay text of Terence). *P. 91.* — delete the first of in "the rank of injustice of it!" *P. 171.* — for "Book VI" read "B. IV" (of the *Tusculans*). *P. 180.* — for "uninformed mob" read "uninformed m." *P. 199.* — for "the use of his word" read "t. u. o. this w." *P. 242.* — for "Massapus" read "Messapus." *P. 273.* — for "Teubner" read "Teubner." *P. 418.* — for "than the fact than" read "t. t. f. that." *P. 419.* — for "worse that a tigress" read "w. than a t."

2. In the Introduction to Thucydides Buffon's *le style est l'homme même* is given without the *même* and cited (as it often is) to imply that style reveals a man's mind or character; in context, however, it means that an author's matter is external to him and transferable, whereas his manner is inalienable and (if it is excellent) guarantees immortality (cf. O. Guerlac, *Les citations françaises* [Paris: Colln, 1931], p. 115).

This work was planned originally for a course dealing "with the political and social background" of classical literature as well as with the literature proper; so selections from the Old Oligarch and Augustus' *Res Gestae* were prepared. There are also interesting excerpts from the Greek scientists. These three items all go to make the volumes an excellent introduction to Greco-Roman civilization, and a few instances of an unfortunate choice among the "literary" texts or of infelicitous translation do not keep them from being a very good one to Greco-Roman belles-lettres. The work is clearly the result of much thought and labor and provides a stimulating, comprehensive survey of classical antiquity.

EDWARD L. BASSETT

University of Chicago

The Iliad of Homer. Translated by RICHMOND LATTIMORE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951. Pp. 527. \$4.50.

As is the generation of leaves, so in our day is that of translations from the classics. Has there ever been a time in history when there was such ever-growing interest in the literatures of antiquity and such ever-diminishing desire to read those literatures in the languages in which they were produced? Fortunately, the spate of recent translations has maintained a high level of quality. Among the best have been Lattimore's, especially, I think, his versions of the tragedians. His already high reputation will be further heightened by this new version of Homer's *Iliad*.

The language is "mostly the plain English of today." I am not myself convinced that this style, so much sought after by so many contemporary translators, is the only proper one for translations today, but Lattimore's *Iliad* displays a high degree of clarity and directness and achieves these ends without wholly sacrificing nobility. The tone is certainly not archaic or "poetical" in any artificial sense, but it is yet elevated and dignified, as befits an old tale of ladies dead and lovely knights.

The form is an irregular long line theoretically containing six beats and a variety of feet, but probably more dactyls than any other single type. As a conservative in metrics, I cannot say I found this side of the work completely satisfactory, though my objections to it weakened steadily as I read. The range between reasonably orthodox English dactylic hexameters and lines I should find it hard to read with even six beats might be illustrated by 3. 53, "Thus you would learn of the man whose blossoming wife you have taken," and 2. 811, "Near the city but apart from it there is a steep hill." The dactylic rhythm is often quite pervasive, and a number of lines end with phrases at least resembling good old-fashioned "strawberry jam pots." (See, for instance, the following from 3. 140-50: "city and parents," "shimmering garments," "went to attend her," "scion of Ares," "men of good counsel.") A surprising number of lines, though, end in a way more reminiscent of hendecasyllabics: "shepherd of the people," "corn-fed at the manger," "massive in the middle," "and the son of Tydeus," "pack and Hector led them," "did it ever happen."

The many excellencies of this translation could be properly illustrated, of course, only by a number of fairly long quotations, but something of the quality of its rhythm and phrasing may be caught even in a few isolated lines: 3. 212, "Now before all when both of them spun their speech and their counsels"; 6. 452-53, "not the thought of my brothers who in their number and valour / shall drop in the dust under the hands of men who hate them"; 9. 385, "not if he gave me gifts as many as the sand or the dust is." The Catalogue of the Ships seems to me especially well done.

There are, of course, some things which "I should have done otherwise": I do not much fancy the word "wine-blue" as an epithet for the sea (or anything else). "Brilliant" is hardly the best translation for the difficult and ubiquitous Homeric *dios*, since in the "plain English of today"

"brilliant" when applied to persons has a consistently and almost exclusively intellectual connotation. Webster's illustration is "a brilliant mathematician." The word is acceptable (if not what Homer meant) for Odysseus and Nestor, but not for Hector or Menelaus. In l. 292, "looking at him darkly brilliant Achilles answered" produces a contrast quite absent from the original. Occasionally elsewhere there are some unfortunate collocations: 3. 109-10, "an elder man . . . looks *behind* him / and in *front*, so that all comes out far better for both *sides*"; 9. 76, "close" is used in quite different senses as a translation for two different Greek words. In 2. 229, "Or is it still more gold you will be wanting," Thersites talks with an Irish lilt. In 20. 227, "tassels of corn" calls up to an American mind a very different picture from the one Homer's audience saw.

The rendering is in general as clear as the original, and it is very seldom that one comes upon a phrase whose meaning is not immediately obvious. Possible exceptions are: 2. 125, 347-49; 18. 122-25; 19. 273. Once in a great while the meaning which Lattimore extracts seems to me at least dubious: 2. 328; 5. 892-94; 8. 189; 13. 450; 19. 4. 247.

The Introduction contains much material on Homer and the Greek epic which should be useful to the non-specialist and surprisingly little to irritate the traditionally touchy and bellicose professional Homerist. The printing is most accurate and (apart from a persistent "Peteus" when Lattimore's system requires "Peteos") I have noticed only four or five misprints. The glossary of proper names might well have included some more patronymics (Peleion, Peleides, Kronion, Kronides), which are especially cryptic to the general reader.

The very number and nature of the points I have questioned should show how little there is to find fault with in this fine book. It is, I think, one of the very few translations of the *Iliad* which a person familiar with the original can read with

continuous pleasure. Lattimore's version makes it clear that the *Iliad* is something more than "the world's greatest war novel" (as the publisher of another modern translation calls it). The Greekless reader may now not only feel he has been in contact with a great book; he may also feel something of the power of a great poem.

FREDERICK M. COMBELLACK

University of Oregon

Poetica Nuova in Lucrezio. By LEONARDO FERRERO. ("Biblioteca di Cultura," No. 31.) Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1949. Pp. viii + 191. L. 550

The thesis propounded by the writer of this book is that Lucretius the poet was not, as is sometimes said or implied, exclusively under the literary influence of the older Roman models, but that he exhibits many, if not most, of the symptoms of "Alexandrianism" appearing in Catullus, the Vergilian appendix, and elsewhere among the "neoterici" of his day. The book is commended to the reader in a brief Foreword by Professor Augusto Rostagni.

The forces which shaped Lucretius' poetry are difficult to measure for the reason that its presumed forbears are largely lost. The most elaborate efforts to determine his literary antecedents have been made by W. A. Merrill¹, with whose work Ferrero gives no sign of being in any way familiar. Indeed, a notable defect in this book would seem to lie in the author's limited acquaintance with the non-Italian literature on Lucretius, including even the definitive edition by Bailey. On the other hand, it is only fair to say that some of the Italian titles cited will be equally unfamiliar to many scholars in this country.

Confining himself to "alcuni aspetti tecnici dell'arte di Lucrezio," Ferrero takes as his point of departure the *multa ars* certainly allowed to the poem (whatever may be said about the *lumina ingeni*)

1. *University of California Publications in Classical Philology*, Vols. II-X, *passim*.

by Cicero, and proceeds to argue that it was in nature largely "neoteric." He finds no difficulty in marshaling a substantial number of features of "la poetica nuova" that are undeniably present in Lucretius. A few of these are his preoccupation with love (Bk. 4 and *passim*) and death (Bk. 3 and *passim*), such idyllic passages as that in the *proemium* to Book 2 (29-33), picturing the ideal Epicurean, like some Theocritean shepherd, at ease amid the grass and flowers by a running stream, etiological digressions like the one (Bk. 2. 600ff.) concerning the worship of the Magna Mater, recurring emphasis upon the agreeable in poetry (its *lepos*) — e.g., (1. 934) *musaeo contingens cuncta lepore*, (4. 909) *suauidicis potius quam multis versibus edam* — and the pessimism which pervades large sections of the work. There is also abundant use of rhetorical devices. Ferrero ranges Lucretius on the side of neotericism, Atticism, and analogy in the literary imbroglia with archaism, Asianism, and anomaly.

With most of this few will be inclined to quarrel, and Ferrero has done a service in emphasizing that Lucretius, although he seems to have been a lonely figure among the *litterati* of his day, nevertheless did not stand entirely aloof from the tides and currents which influenced his contemporaries. Still, the features of "la poetica nuova" which appear in Lucretius are in large part implicit in didactic poetry or in Epicureanism itself. It might perhaps more fairly be represented that the reason for the appeal of Epicureanism to Lucretius and others in the first century before Christ was that it fitted the temper of the times than that fashionable moods and habits of thought and expression were admitted by Lucretius into its exposition, to serve as the honey on the rim of the medicine cup. The problem is to some degree tied up with the whole vexed question of Lucretius' sources and the degree of originality which he allowed himself in the development of his theme. This reviewer continues to feel that, if issue must be joined, there is more of the classical and

rugged about the *De rerum natura* than there is of the Hellenistic and refined.

ARTHUR F. STOCKER

University of Virginia

The Annals of Tacitus: A Study in the Writing of History. By B. WALKER. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1952. Pp. viii+284. 18s.

The author's purpose has been to make a detailed study of the *Annals* with respect to Tacitus' "methods of composition, the variations in his style, and the reasons why he interpreted the events of the first century as he did" (p. v.). This purpose has been brilliantly achieved; the present work is a contribution of the first order to the understanding of Tacitus as historian, artist, and man.

It is agreed that Tacitus was meticulous about statements of fact, and that he took great pains to ascertain the truth in matters of this sort. Nevertheless the impression which readers commonly derive from the *Annals* is markedly at variance with that obtained from a factual summary of the Tacitean account. The discrepancy between impression and fact in this work was illustrated many years ago by Friedrich Leo, who pointed out in a Göttingen lecture (cited p. 117) that almost everyone finishes the narrative of Germanicus' death and its aftermath in the second and third books of the *Annals* persuaded that Piso poisoned Germanicus, although Tacitus not only does not say this, but reports that at Piso's trial the charge of poisoning was dismissed as without foundation, and its existence is apparent to anybody comparing the story of A.D. 14-66 as Tacitus tells it with the versions of present-day historians, for whom Tacitus is the principal literary source of information. To some extent this conflict results from the historian's practice of imputing motives, for which Napoleon took him to task: "Parce qu'il est profond lui, il prête des desseins profonds à tout ce qu'on dit. Mais il n'y a rien de

plus rare que des desseins";¹ in addition, as T. S. Jerome well emphasized, Tacitus' oratorical education disposed him to envisage individuals in terms of the conventionalized figures of the schools, the Tyrant, Victim, and the rest, with consequent distortion,² but the discrepancy calls for much more precise and circumstantial explanation. This need suggested the method followed in the analytical chapters of the book. These are devoted to a scrutiny of the construction and style of the *Annals* from the point of view of formal literary criticism. By observing how Tacitus selects and arranges his subject matter, and by identifying the various techniques employed in interpretative and expository passages, the author has in large measure been able to determine the extent, nature, and *raison d'être* of the discrepancy in question, and to shed much light on Tacitus' conception of history and handling of the problems encountered in writing of the early Principate.

Analysis of the structure of the surviving books of the *Annals* shows that "within the annalistic framework, Tacitus' treatment of his material is very episodic. In enumerating the events of each year, Tacitus frequently selects a single incident for thoroughly detailed description" (p. 16), passing over the other events of the year in summary fashion. For example, the return of Agrippina and Piso's trial occupy the greater part of the section dealing with A.D. 19, and Nero's murder of his mother is given unique prominence in the narrative of the year 59. The incidents in this way set in relief support and exemplify Tacitus' conviction (essentially poetic rather than "historical") that the history of the Principate during the period of the *Annals* represented the progressive triumph of evil; this is evident not only from the nature of the events placed in the foreground, but from a number of con-

stantly reiterated themes, which greatly reinforce the impression produced by the major incidents. In the first six books the recurrent themes are the personality of Tiberius, the struggle for the succession, and the operation of the *maiestas* law; in the last six, the intrigues of the court, the decline of political liberty, and the demoralization of Roman society. Tacitus' view of these years is reflected in the manner in which he selects and sets forth his factual subject matter, and it has exerted immense influence upon his treatment of material other than factual. "Since Tacitus regarded oppression and moral decline as the most important trends of the period, it is natural that his most elaborate writing should be found in episodes which will illustrate and emphasize these themes. Inevitably there is much non-factual material in such contexts; few historians can be content with a bare recital of facts in the passages which they themselves feel to be historically most significant" (p. 33). When the story has no direct relevance to Tacitus' principal themes (as in the conspectus of Oriental affairs in 11.8-10), it is told in plain, forthright language, but wherever major episodes and dominant themes are concerned, Tacitus has recourse to "an elaborate and subtle narrative technique" which sharply contrasts with the uncomplicated style used to relate matters which do not touch him emotionally.³ Pages 35 to 77 anatomize and describe this technique with rare finesse and insight. Four elements are distinguished: (a) the dramatic, which determines the arrangement of events and treatment of character, (b) the rhetorical (often inseparable from the dramatic) which comprises such devices as form part of the equipment of the professional orator, (c) richness of vocabulary, and (d) "allusiveness." This last "means that an event or person is not described directly, or not only directly, but in connection with another set of circum-

1. Quoted in E. Bacha, *Le génie de Tacite* (Brussels and Paris, 1906), p. 10.

2. See "The Tacitean Tiberius: A Study in Historiographic Method," *CP*, VII (1912), 265-92, and *Aspects of the Study of Roman History* (New York, 1923), pp. 319-80.

3. Bacha, *op. cit.*, pp. 83-84, remarks that Tacitus customarily reports well-authenticated facts without elaboration.

stances, or persons, or ideas, which make us see the immediate subject in a new light" (pp. 66-67). In some cases this is done explicitly, in others by indirection, as in the parallel implied between Tiberius and Livia on the one hand and Nero and Agrippina on the other. Literary reminiscences play a certain role here; in particular Sallust and Virgil are echoed repeatedly to produce specific aesthetic effects. This technique, as has been observed, comes into play whenever the historian develops themes or relates incidents germane to his central thesis, and it is not surprising that he should seek to stress and point up those parts of the story he regards as particularly meaningful; the strange thing is that on many occasions Tacitus employs his stylistic virtuosity "not to underline facts, but to obscure them" (p. 82). A prime illustration of this is the account of Germanicus' death and the subsequent trial of Piso; on pages 110 to 131 the subtlety with which Tacitus manipulates language to create the misleading impression which Leo remarked is discussed in illuminating detail. The divergence between the evidence presented and the effect achieved comes out most distinctly in the account of the *maiestas* trials under Tiberius. "The facts in Tacitus provide evidence of a legislative weakness which gave scope for abuse, abuse fully realised in the time of Nero and still more of Domitian, but probably not foreseen by many people until the latter part of Tiberius' reign. There is no evidence of any intention on Tiberius' part to develop the *maiestas* law as a means of oppression and very little evidence that it was so used in his time" (p. 87). But as soon as Tacitus' attention shifts from the relatively innocuous factual data bearing upon this legislation to the interpretation thereof, he regularly assumes "the melancholy tone of the prophet . . . if his indignation seems sometimes to outstrip the cause, it derives from the bitterness of one wise after the event . . . By the end of Book I Tacitus has so impressed the ominous nature of the *maiestas* law upon the reader's mind that

in Books II-IV whenever there are legal proceedings against anyone we are apt to assume that the *maiestas* law is being invoked, and that unjustly, unless Tacitus states otherwise, which he does not often do" (p. 87), and "Where there is doubt Tacitus' procedure is always the same: he admits that it exists, and goes on to write as if it did not" (p. 108).

This holds good for the first six books of the *Annals*, which have long been recognized as the most bizarre and "Tacitean" portion of the historian's writings from a stylistic point of view. In these books the utmost resources of Tacitus' style are consistently called forth to place construction upon events that cannot be justified by logical inference, and "it is precisely where facts contradict the non-factual material that Tacitus' style becomes most sensational" (p. 158); on the other hand examination of Books 11-16 reveals, most significantly, that matters are quite different in this part of the history. There is here no lack of material which relates directly to Tacitus' central theme (the Pisonian conspiracy affords a striking example of oppression and moral decay), but the circumstances speak for themselves; there is no gap or incongruity between what happened and what Tacitus believes must be the truth behind the phenomena, and consequently little need for stylistic artifice: "where he is on certain grounds his style becomes direct, terse, and forceful, and though he may introduce some rhetorical or poetic colouring this is done straightforwardly, without eccentricity" (p. 160).

Thus far the conclusions put forward have been supported by evidence so abundant and compelling as to give them almost mathematical cogency; the remaining third of the book, an inquiry into the reasons that constrained Tacitus to write as he did, is of necessity much more hypothetical. It is argued with force that Tacitus did not designedly distort the truth, and that there can be no question here of "rhetorical license" (proper interpretation of the familiar "opus oratorium maxime"

does not support the assumption that ancient theory allowed the historian the same leeway with facts that custom sanctioned in the case of lawyers and statesmen; what Cicero meant, as E. Courbaud pointed out, is simply that "il faut exiger d'elle [l'histoire] ce qu'on exige d'un discours, qu'elle soit une oeuvre composée, habilement présentée, rehaussée par le style",⁴ but rather that he envisaged history in the manner of an epic poet; the events of A.D. 14-68 appeared to him as a sort of *Aeneid à rebours*: "the idea of a national destiny working in obedience to a higher will beyond human understanding animates the *Annals* no less than the *Aeneid*. In Virgil fate is benevolent though harsh, the national destiny is to be a noble empire; in Tacitus the higher will is wrathful judgment and the national destiny ruin" (p. 155). Since Tacitus held this to be the pattern and the meaning of the historical manifestations of these years, and had convinced himself that the last vestiges of good had died with Germanicus, Tiberius, no matter what appearances may have been, must be thoroughly evil, and the historian is at pains thus to portray him, not however without involuntary misgivings, which are reflected in tensions and anomalies of style, which increase in proportion to the discrepancy between the events recorded and what Tacitus wishes to believe is the truth behind them. Such a conception of history may in part be explained in terms of Tacitus' temperament and education, but it also betrays, the author suggests, a sense of guilt for time-serving under Domitian. Tacitus' conduct (and that of his father-in-law Agricola) could be vindicated only by positing that "in an evil world the spirit of *prisca virtus* could appear only in the guise of resigned passivity. Tacitus has tried to demonstrate this by presenting the whole development of the Empire as a conflict between evil and good, in which good is early and finally and inevitably defeated" (pp. 202-3). Whenever the evidence is not

adequate to sustain this thesis, or runs counter to it, "the elaborate 'coloured' style is used to blanket intellectual weaknesses in the interpretation of history which Tacitus' intuitive and emotional nature has evolved in his own defence" (p. 203).

It is futile to attempt to do even rudimentary justice to the later, "non-factual" chapters in a few sentences, and the foregoing paragraph makes no such pretension. They are distinguished by the same human and literary perspicacity and sureness of method as the chapters concerned with philological fact; the answer they proffer to the central Tacitean problem, to the question of Tacitus' aim and motives in composing the *Annals*, is not only most ably worked out, but also, this reviewer is convinced, true.⁵

RICHARD T. BRUÈRE

University of Chicago

5. One or two questionable points have been noted, a few inadvertences, and some errata: p. 4, line 8 from bottom: read *memoriam*; p. 14 (table): Tiberius' principate lasted 23 years, not 34, Claudius' 13, not 8; *ibid.*: Polybius' *History* (40 books) was not arranged "in groups of 6 books"; p. 15, l. 15: read "41-7"; p. 23, n. 3: an omission should be indicated after *eiusdem*, and the next word corrected to *uterentur*; p. 24, l. 9: *fecit*, not *fuit*; p. 30, l. 11 from bottom: e, not a; p. 31, n. 7: correct to XV. 36. ii; p. 51, l. 16: *ezitti*; p. 53, n. 3, l. 6: *obneras*; p. 55, n. 2: the first reference to Sall. *Cat.* should be 5. vi, not 7. ii; p. 61: *praecolidus* (*Ann.* 13. 16. 3) is not "otherwise unknown" (see Lewis and Short *s.v.*); p. 81, n. 6: *erant*; p. 83: "When Tacitus speaks of an 'immensa strages' in the year 33, and goes on to give a painfully vivid description which suggests the worst scenes of modern mass-persecution, it is something of a shock to find from Suetonius [*Tib.* 61]... that on this occasion there were not more than twenty persons involved": Tacitus beyond doubt is exaggerating grossly, but Suetonius' "viginti uno die abiecti tractique" need not imply, *pace* Furneaux, that no more than twenty persons were killed following the order to "liquidate" all prisoners accused of complicity with Sejanus; the context suggests rather that the extent of the total slaughter was indicated by the circumstance that twenty were put to death in just one day; *ibid.*: "an interesting but quite irrelevant chapter on the history of the phoenix" [6. 28], but cf. p. 45: "Often they [T.'s digressions] do contribute indirectly to the story's dramatic development, as in... the account of the phoenix's origin and history... (where) the subject selected... has a peculiar appropriateness"; p. 88, l. 13: *praetore* should follow *Macro*; p. 90, l. 12: add *maiestatis* after *Crispinus*; *ibid.*, n. 1: in the quotation from Lucan 9. 397 *vestra* should follow *pericula*; p. 101, l. 4: *violatae* (not *laesae*) *maiestatis*; p. 104, l. 12: 52, v (not 53, i); p. 112, l. 15: the source for the date of Germanicus' death (10 Oct. 19) is not *Ann.* 2. 72, but *Fast. Ant.*, cited by Furneaux *ad loc.*; p. 113, l. 5: *causam*, l. 9, *templis*, l. 12, "79", l. 15, "80"; p. 119, l. 7: excise *iam*; p. 120, n. 1: *privatis*; p.

4. E. Courbaud, *Les procédés d'art de Tacite dans les "Histoires"* (Paris, 1918), p. 7.

Pliny: Natural History (with an English Translation). In 10 vols. Vols. V and IX translated by † H. RACKHAM ("Loeb Classical Library," Nos. 371 and 394.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950 and 1952. Pp. vii+544 and pp. vii+421. Each \$ 3.00. Vol. VI translated by W. H. S. JONES ("Loeb Classical Library," No. 392.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951. Pp. xxiv+532. \$3.00.

Volume V (containing Books 17-19, which treat of arboriculture, cereals, plants used in the manufacture of textiles, and garden produce) was in galley proof at the time of Mr. Rackham's death; Professor E. H. Warmington has seen it through the press, after having rewritten portions of the translation; in the case of Volume IX (Books 33-35, dealing with metals and mining, and including the well-known sections on painting and statuary) only a draft of the translation had been completed, together with a few footnotes; the Latin text, critical notes, marginalia, and most of the explanatory material are the work of Professor Warmington.

Some years ago Mr. Rackham stated that his purpose was to help the student to read Pliny's text and not "to supply the English reader with a substitute for the Latin."¹ Despite this disclaimer, his translation, which comprises twenty-two of the thirty-seven books of the *Natural History*,

has much merit in its own right; pleasantly written and in the main accurate, it represents a courageous and largely successful endeavor to make understandable to modern readers a Latin text as remarkable for its obscurities as for its bizarre "facts," and one from which time and centuries of fascinated readers have taken their toll.

Volumes V and IX (translated by Mr. Rackham) may conveniently be considered together, before passing to Volume VI (translated by Dr. Jones). Many conjectural emendations by the translator appear in the text of V; although some of these seem unnecessary, none are implausible, and a number are unusually felicitous, e.g., "aquosa sede" (17. 28), "fasciari" (17. 112), "varo" (18. 174), and "inseratur" (19. 84). More conjectures, often interesting, may be found in the apparatus, which also furnishes a conspectus of critical suggestions made by editors from Hermolaus Barbarus to Mayhoff. In the text of IX there are few new emendations; of these "exhibetur" (Warmington) in 34. 108 appears the most probable.

The English version offered in the two volumes calls for little general comment. The practice of "translating" ancient place names by their modern equivalents may be disconcerting, particularly when the modern name is less familiar than the ancient one: La Riccia and San Vettorino for Aricia and Amiternum strike a false note, although the identifications are correct; sometimes, however, they are questionable, as in the case of *Mons Algidus* (18. 130) which becomes "Monte Compatri" (V, 273), although the hill concerned is more probably the present Monte Ceraso.² And surely little is gained by replacing Pliny's *Athos* (18. 215) by the obscure designation "Monte Santo" (V, 325). Not everything, however, has been transmuted into modern terms. To render "Olympias" (17. 232) by "Olympias wind" (V, 161) without explanation is hardly

124, l. 11: *suos*, l. 13, *aequabat*, l. 5 from bottom, *feralis*; p. 125, l. 12: *exciperent*, l. 12 from bottom, *propositam*; p. 128, n. 1: XIV. 7. v; p. 134, n. 2, l. 9: *invaderet*; p. 142, n. 1: correct to "fifth century" (Orosius); p. 143, n. 1: the sentence from Dio is marred by three misprints and one omission (cf. p. 173, n. 2, and p. 213, n. 3); p. 144: the statement quoted in lines 8-11 is from *Ann.* 3. 19. 3, not "Hist. 1. 2"; p. 156, n. 3: correct second reference to VII. 404-5, and in the fifth quotation read *colt*, not *volet*; p. 172: "in Pliny, Martial, and Juvenal one hears repeatedly of meetings where the members recited the praises of Brutus, read Lucan, and exchanged their own literary productions on similar subjects"; these authors do not mention Lucan being read or Brutus praised at such gatherings; p. 229, l. 6 from bottom: *egere*; p. 236, l. 10 from bottom: *peregrinationis*; p. 237, l. 11: *quietam*; p. 240, n. 2: *scelera* has dropped out before *nuper*; p. 244: "and he [T.] was content to abuse the Jews as the dregs of Roman society, 'deterrima gens,' etc.": the Tacitean epithet is *tacterrima* (*Hist.* 5. 8. 9); the historian has reference to the Jews of Judaea.

1. In a Prefatory Note on p. v of the second volume of this translation (1942).

2. See M. Besnier, *Lexique de géographie ancienne* (Paris, 1914), p. 34.

translating, and it should somewhere be made clear that "mid-summer" and "mid-winter" (regularly used for *solstitium* and *bruma* [V, 79, 93, 101, 359 and *passim*]) refer to the Roman seasons, which were half over when ours begin. Calling the Attalids "Kings of Asia" (IX, 51) will mislead those who are not aware that Pliny has the Roman province of Asia (ex-Pergamum) in mind.

In some places doubtful or erroneous renderings occur:³ "Ennius antiquissimus vates" (18. 84) probably designates Ennius as a very early Latin poet, not as "the oldest of our bards" (V, 243); *lurido* (18. 98) is not "livid" (V, 251). In 18. 105: "quidam ex ovis aut lacte subigunt, butyro vero gentes etiam pacatae, ad operis pistorii genera transeunte cura" is translated: "Some use eggs or milk in kneading the dough, while even butter has been used by races enjoying peace, when attention can be devoted to the varieties of pastry-making" (V, 257). But Pliny wishes to say that barbarian tribes (*gentes*), even after they have been subdued and incorporated into the Empire (*pacatae*), persist in using butter, actually employing it in pastry-making, a practice to which in their new status they have begun to turn their attention [presumably from petty warfare and marauding], much as an Eskimo, after learning about baking cakes from contact with white men, might nevertheless remain faithful to his traditional seal blubber, shortening his pastry with it, rather than with lard or Mazola. "Ob insignem calumniam" (33. 152) means "for grossly false and malicious accusation" rather than "on a singularly grave charge" (IX, 113). In the anecdote of Cicero's re-

3. A few *minutiae* may be listed: *friabilis* (17. 29) is not "pliable" (V, 21); *a. d. VIII Kal. Ian.* (18. 221) is 25, not 26, December (V, 329); *calliblepharon* (33. 102) is not a "beauty-wash for women's eyebrows" (IX, 79), but rather, as *LSJ* defines it (Vol. I, 867), "paint for the eyelids and eyelashes" (both Rackham and Jones mis-translate this word [IX, 405, and VI, 251 and 479]); *M. Aemilio C. Popilio iterum cos.* (34. 30) is translated "in the second consulship of Marcus Aemilius and Gaius Popilius" (IX, 151), but only for Popilius was it the second consulship; *hemina* is about half a pint, not "a twelfth of a pint" (IX, 219); "Bon viveur" (IX, 315) in French would mean "kindly rake"; it is not equivalent to *habrodiactus* (35. 71), which means "an exquisite."

tort to Hortensius' protest he was not able to understand riddles, that he should have no difficulty, "quoniam sphingem domi haberet" (34. 48), the latter part of the translation "'You ought to be,' said Cicero, 'as you keep a figurine in your pocket'" (IX, 163) is wrong. Togas have no pockets, the Sphinx in question was not a figurine, and "domi" here can only mean "at home." In section 48 Pliny lists a number of people who became so attached to favorite statues that they took them with them in their baggage wherever they went. One of the connoisseurs cited is Nero, who carried Strongylion's "Amazon" with him on all his travels (for further details, see 34. 82); Hortensius, allegedly inseparable from the Sphinx which Verres had given him, is another. The statues are plainly of normal dimensions, large enough to be troublesome to transport; that their owners were sufficiently infatuated to go to such trouble is what impresses Pliny.

The explanatory notes to Volumes V and IX in a number of instances require correction.⁴ In V, eight misprints have been observed, in IX, seven.⁵ The Indexes

4. The statement "The Romans always drank their wine mixed with water" (V, 36, n. c) is too sweeping, as readers of Horace will recognize; calling the black stone brought from Pessinus to Rome in 204 a.c. "the statue of Cybele" is inexact (V, 198, n. d). Apropos of Pliny's "in the consulship of Publius Aelius and Gnaeus Cornelius, the year in which Hannibal was overcome" (V, 295), it is observed "At the battle of Zama, 202 a.c." (V, 294, n. a); the consuls mentioned, however, held office in 201. To the translation of "Vergilio quoque confesso quam sit difficile verborum honorem tam parvis perhibere" (19. 59), the note is added "Possibly an allusion to *Georg.* IV. 6: *in tenui labor, etc.*" (V, 458, n. a); in fact Pliny here almost paraphrases *Georg.* 3. 289-90: "nec sum animi dubius verbis ea vincere magnum/ quam sit et angustis hunc addere rebus honorem." "Caeclius Metellus, who in 251 a.c. defeated the Carthaginian fleet at Palermo" (V, 502, n. a); Metellus' victory at Panormus was on land; it took place in 250. In the margin beside the translation of "Cornelio Cethego in consulatu collega Quinti Flamini" (19. 156), the date 323 a.c. is given (V, 521). Here both Pliny and his annotator are in error; Cethegus was not Flaminius' colleague in the consulship; Flaminius held the office in 198 a.c., Cethegus, the next year. The marginal date 305 a.c. (consulship of Sempronius and Sulpicius) should be corrected to 304 (IX, 17). "Fenestella died in a.d. 21" (IX, 108, n. b); according to the *OCD*, 19 or 36. "Healing of Telephus by rust from Achilles' sword" (IX, 314, n. a); "spear."

5. V, 14, l. 15; p. 62, l. 4; p. 122, l. 20; p. 330, l. 6; p. 336, l. 19; p. 404, l. 18; p. 424, l. 14; p. 466, l. 23. IX, 12, l. 14; p. 18, l. 3; p. 44, l. 9; p. 66, l. 16; p. 112, l. 3; p. 244, l. 22; p. 316, l. 1.

to IX (artists, museographic, minerals) are full and accurate; the Index of Persons at the end of V, however, contains a good deal of misinformation.⁶

No scholar could be better qualified than Dr. Jones for translating and elucidating the books of the *Natural History* which have to do with the medicinal virtues of trees, plants, and flowers (20-27); his Volume VI, which comprises Books 20-23, is a first-rate piece of work in every respect. The Introduction informatively discusses Pliny's medical terminology, pharmacology, and botany. In connection with the last topic the relation between the encyclopedist and Dioscorides is examined, and there are some interesting observations on his chapters on the Magi. The text is well constituted, and the translation elegant and precise.⁷ The explanatory notes perfectly fulfill their purpose; of especial value are those which illustrate how Pliny used and upon occasion misunderstood his Greek sources. Despite the title "Persons, Deities and Races" the Index contains no ethnic matter. There are almost no misprints.⁸

RICHARD T. BRUÈRE

University of Chicago

Senilis Amor. Edited and translated by LAURENS J. MILLS. ("Indiana University Publications," Humanities Series,

6. "Atilius Regulus, consul 257 and 256"; 267 and 256. "Attalus, Philometor, king of Cappadocia"; Pergamum. "Cato, M. Porcius, 234-147"; more probably 149 (*OCD*). "Catulus, Q., defeated Cimbri 103 a.c."; 101. "Conon... XVII 312"; XVIII. "Domitius Ahenobarbus, consul 69 a.c."; 54. Sura Mamilius (not "Man"). "Trogus, historian under Antonines"; T. lived under Augustus.

7. In 20. 82 *insomnia* is translated "dreams" (p. 49), although the alternative "want of sleep" is indicated in a footnote. Pliny here is referring to Cato *De r. r.* 157, where Cato declares that cabbage will cure anyone who is *insomnitosus*. Since Pliny couples *vigilias* with *insomnia*, he must have understood Cato to be speaking of sleeplessness rather than dreams. It is not clear why *nitrum* is rendered by "saltpetre" on p. 349, whereas elsewhere it is translated "soda" (pp. 221, 365, 367).

8. P. 262, l. 18; p. 406, l. 14. On pp. 359 and 493 "yolk" has become "yoke."

No. 27.) Bloomington, Indiana: University Press, 1952. Pp. v+167. \$2.50.

This volume forms a companion to the edition and translation of Peter Hausted's *Senile Odium* which Professor Mills published in this series several years ago.¹ Like that play, *Senilis Amor* is a lively example of seventeenth-century academic Latin comedy, and it too "smells both of the lamp and the alehouse."²

It has been assumed, with varying degrees of confidence, that Hausted was the author of *Senilis Amor* (the only manuscript of the play bears no indication of authorship). This attribution, which rests upon several correspondences in plot and incident between the plays, as well as upon the similarity of their titles, is shown on stylistic grounds to be untenable (pp. 5-9). Analysis reveals that the habits of style of the authors of the plays are in many respects quite different; the contrast is especially marked in the case of certain adverbs and interjections. For example, in Hausted's comedy *euge* is found seventeen times, in *Senilis Amor*, not at all; on the other hand *en* occurs in the latter play fourteen times, but not once in *Senile Odium* (p. 7). It will no longer be possible to maintain that Hausted wrote *Senilis Amor*.

The only source for the text of *Senilis Amor* is a careless and somewhat jumbled copy of (presumably) the author's holograph. This has made the piece more difficult to edit than *Senile Odium* had been, for Hausted's comedy was "pretty accurately printed,"³ doubtless under the author's supervision, by the Cambridge University Press in 1633. Some of the copyist's blunders have been detected and removed, but the editor has missed a good number, and has introduced some of his own. The long *s*'s of the manuscript have upon several occasions led him astray (we find "sigulavit" for "figulavit" on p. 30, and in an echo of the fourth line of the *Ars poetica* [duly identified in a footnote],

1. No. 19 (Bloomington, 1949).

2. *Op. cit.*, p. 9.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

"definit in piscem," which is unabashedly translated "terminates into a fish" [pp. 122 and 123, and p. 166, n. 34]), and there are many more textual blemishes.⁴

Where the translator understands the Latin, his version is more than adequate, and shows a nice feeling for contemporary or almost contemporary colloquialisms. But, alas, the Latin text often is too much for him, and this has led to many "howlers." Some examples are given in the following paragraph; they by no means exhaust the list.⁵

4. P. 20, l. 5 from bottom: read "plurimae"; p. 24, l. 4: "facinus"; p. 28, l. 5 from b.: "januas"; p. 28, l. 6: "domum"; p. 40, l. 14 from b. "Ethioplus" (?); p. 68, l. 12 from b. "latera", l. 2 from b., "superfruit"; p. 70, l. 5: "dedissent," l. 2 from b.: "evadendi"; p. 74, l. 7: "erebi"; p. 76, l. 4 from b.: "eulusnam"; p. 80, l. 12: "immedicabilia"; p. 94, l. 5 from b.: "auro"; p. 106, l. 3: "vidisse," l. 14: "elati"; p. 110, l. 9 "agninis," l. 8 from b.: "baeulum"; p. 112, l. 2: "nummum"; p. 114, l. 1: "rapax," l. 9 from b.: "deaque"; p. 118, l. 5: "letho"; p. 126, l. 7: "lavavi," l. 8: "rubro"; p. 132, l. 13 from b.: "ferendo"; p. 148, l. 15: "linguam"; p. 150, l. 10: "consortem"; p. 152, l. 6 from b.: "vana"; p. 154, last l.: "vestes." Bad punctuation makes the text unreadable on p. 56, l. 3 from b., and on p. 62, l. 10 from b. Here the quotation marks are misplaced; if the passage is to make sense, the quotation should begin with "in principio" in the previous line. In the Introduction "actus est" (p. 2) should be corrected to "actum est," and "jauna, jaunas" (p. 8) to "janua, etc."

5. Relatively venial infelicities such as "loved... to his own destruction" for "amavit perdit" and "preserve in marble" for "conde marmore" (both p. 25) are too numerous to mention. Less pardonable are: "See this letter of yours unclaimed by your lover" for "vide litteras mariti viduatas nomine" (pp. 34 and 35) and "They've broken my back" for "fregerunt verticem" (pp. 44 and 45). The elaborately prepared scatological pun on pp. 54 and 62 ("Mildreda in lecto pisat et cacabat") is not even hinted at in the translation (cf. the failure to take cognizance of the horseplay alluding to "morbus Gallicus" on pp. 30ff., and to notice the pun on "gyri" toward the bottom of p. 128). "Swelling gout" (p. 59) does not precisely render "nodosa podagra" (p. 58). "Scena vix carui" (p. 76) does not mean "I hardly needed to think up an excuse" (p. 77). The familiar proverb "laterem lavo" (p. 78) is ineptly rendered "I wash the surface" (p. 79). "Lucae bovem" (p. 80), "Lucanian ox" (p. 81). The translator misses the point of "dispercam funditus" (p. 82), is unaware that "orbes" (p. 94) means "spheres," believes "flamen" to mean "flame" (p. 96), and "ne Gru quidem" to refer to ignorance of Greek (p. 98); he takes the vocative "serve" (p. 104, l. 3 from b.) to be an imperative, and he does not know that "Gentes" means "heathen" (p. 108). "Non alliam expeto provinciam" ("I'm not looking for another job") is grotesquely mistranslated "I don't reach the realm of the other" (pp. 118 and 119). "Temerarie" (p. 136, l. 5 from b.) is curiously taken to be an adverb. Lynceus has become confused with the daughters of Belus (pp. 140 and 141); "palus jurata divis" (p. 140) is rendered "bog dedicated to the gods" (the translator is innocent of *Ov. Met.* 2. 46: *die iuranda palus*); "calcabo podicem" (p. 152) is translated "I'll beat your rear end" (p. 153).

P. 29: "Et si virginum fervor intepescat castior, Veneri gratias, vxores hujus modi capiuntur jocis," "And if, thanks to Venus, the ardor of maidens for chastity becomes cooled somewhat, wives of this sort are obtained by — sport, shall we say?" (actually, "Should maidens become cool and chaste, married women, thanks be to Venus, may be inveigled by high-jinks of this sort"). Pp. 62 and 63: "Foras calamistrata coma; domi mediusfidius tam subrasum caput Pro [sic] longitudine inter capillos et aures duellum oritur," "Whenever you come forth... it is with your hair curled; at home, so help me, your head is so flowing that a contest for length arises between your hair and your ears"; the question here is how the translator hit upon the incredible "flowing" for *subrasum* ("close-cropped"); for the answer see *Harper's, s. v.* "surrado" II: "Transf., of a river, to run close under, to flow along or past: barbaros fines, Amm. 28, 2, 1." Pp. 66 and 67: "Cor immolabo Catharinae proprijs evulsam manibus," "I will sacrifice Catharina's heart, plucked out with my own hands" (in fact, "I'll sacrifice my heart, plucked out with my own hands, to Catharina"). Pp. 86 and 87: "Mutate vestes. Errorem sic facile inducetis oculis, Qui continuo observant filiam," "Change your clothes. Thus you will readily see with your own eyes this strolling around, those who one after another pay attention to my daughter" (more correctly, "... thus you will easily deceive the eyes that keep continuous watch over my daughter"). Pp. 90 and 91: "Ad Antonini domum prae me tardus esset si adesset Pegasus," "If Pegasus were to arrive at the home of Antoninus before me, he would be late" (preferably, "Were Pegasus here, he would be slow in comparison to me in reaching Antoninus' house"). Pp. 120 and 121: "Quae [gemma] si supremi Jovis penderet auribus, caesariem Aethiopico nodatam gyro tenderet ilico, ut deorum synodo Ornatum ostendat talem," "If this jewel hung in the ears of great Jove, it would instantly lighten those locks of his knotted black ring, so that he would show so distinguished an ornament to the synod of the gods." This is partly gibberish. What the strange Latin apparently means is that if such a gem hung in great Jove's ear, he would straightway stretch out (pull aside) his kinky, Ethiopian-like

hair so as to display the jewel to the divine assembly.⁶

The reviewer regrets the necessity of censuring the grave defects of this book, for the author has shown enterprise and courage in undertaking a task which professional Latinists have neglected. However, if the errors that similarly disfigured the translation of *Senile Odium*⁷ had been pointed out with equal candor, the present work might well have been less unsatisfactory.

RICHARD T. BRUÈRE

University of Chicago

A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language, Vol. I. Rev. ed. By EDGAR H. STURTEVANT and E. ADELAIDE HAHN. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951. Pp. xx+199. \$5.00.

In this book 2499 words enter into discussion, if the Index may be trusted. Of these 1268 are Hittite, 897 Indo-European (230 Sanskrit, 25 Iranian, 10 Tocharish, 2 Phrygian, 6 Armenian, 245 Greek, 250 Latin, 22 Osco-Umbrian, 14 Keltic, 22 Baltic, 19 Slavonic) and 35 Anatolian (7 Lydian, 11 Lycian, 13 Luwian, 3 Palaic, and 1 Milyan). Of the Anatolian words only four are involved in the account of Hittite grammar; the rest appear in the course of the argument that Hittite and Anatolian come from Proto-Anatolian, i.e., as special witnesses. In this argument eight characteristics are cited; in the rest of the book, a rough count gives (in round numbers) about 200 features in which there is agreement between Hittite and Indo-European, only about 10 unequivocal features which suggest that Hittite

might not be Indo-European, and every Indo-European language has some such number, Keltic for example many more. It may be objected that paucity of material has something to do with these distributions. But there are 150 Lycian inscriptions and 54 Lydian; and it cannot be paucity of material, but extent of acquaintance, that limits citation from Iranian, Tocharish, Armenian, Keltic, or Balto-Slavonic. The explanation is obvious: "too little is known about the Anatolian languages . . . for a detailed comparison of them to be profitable" (Sturtevant p. 9), a damning admission. The fact is that when Hittite words are written phonetically the alleged contrast between "Proto-Anatolian" and "Proto-Indo-European" ceases to be "clear-cut" so far as Hittite is concerned, so that Sturtevant's "Indo-Hittite" stands revealed as a figment. Thus we read of "Indo-Hittite" *'esmi, 'esti, 'ed-, geny, neb'es-, neyo-, pedom, septmo-, yes-, yet-* which do not differ from Indo-European (some would write *H* etc., instead of *'* etc.). The verbal "secondary" ending 1 sg. *-m* explains Hittite *-un* as well as Greek *-α*, and the acc. plu. *-ns* Hittite *-us* as well as Greek *-ας*. The terminations set up for "Indo-Hittite" *ō*-stems *-os* nom., *-om* acc. (and neuter) differ not at all from Indo-European; and for "Indo-Hittite" personal pronouns *'ég* "I," *mé* "me," *uéis* "we," *'nós, 'ns(-smé)* "us" but insignificantly from Indo-European. Differences are prominent when and only when Hittite has preserved an Indo-European laryngeal elsewhere lost; however, it is necessary to assume laryngeals in Indo-European both to give it a coherent pattern and also to reduce the excessively large number of I. Eu. phonemes to a rational total. It is in syntax that Hittite, like all Indo-European languages, goes its own way. But Sturtevant is known to have held that comparative syntax is largely fictional; and in the paper which he read before the Linguistic Society at a recent annual meeting he freely admitted that to substitute Indo-European everywhere for his "Indo-Hittite" would break

6. Or possibly, "his hair knotted in an Ethiopian circle," whatever that is.

7. For instance, "purissimum pollen, suum furfur" ("the finest flour [has] its bran") is translated "the purest pollen its thief" (pp. 44 and 45), and "quod sentimus plus satis quam sit exiguum" (p. 182), "and that we suppose, is more than a little" (p. 183). Here Hausted (unbeknown to his translator) is parodying the beginning of the *Pro Archia*; the Latin means "and we know all too well how small that [the *ingenium* of the previous speaker] is."

no bones; even the most sanguine will shy at pre-Indo-Hittite (p. 37).

It is unfortunate that this concession finds no mention in the grammar, that opinion contrary to the author's is almost entirely suppressed, and the impression given is one of extreme dogmatism. What is one to make of a comparison (p. 109) of Hittite *ta-an* "and him" with I. Eu. **tom*, when admittedly (p. 41) we ought to have **tōm*?

Misprints are numerous, both the harmless variety (e.g., "labilization," p. 38) and those that are misleading (*pérum*, p. 61).

Yet Sturtevant's Hittite grammar is by far the best description of Hittite in existence. It is of great and solid merit as a work of reference that Indo-Europeanists will keep by them constantly. Most of Sturtevant's grammar proper will find its way into any new and comprehensive account — no, not of Indo-Hittite, but of Indo-European; τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδῆ.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory in Europe, with Particular Reference to Modern Linguistic Doctrine. By R. H. ROBINS. London: G. Bell & Sons, Ltd., 1951. Pp. viii + 104. 8s.6d.

Notwithstanding the qualifying clause in its title, linguists will find less interest than philologists in *Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory in Europe*, a topic essentially antiquarian. The author himself is aware (p. v) that modern descriptive method has more in common with Pāṇini, different as was his aim — and different also from that of Greek and Roman grammarians and of their successors. The chief standard of excellence to the modern structuralist is economy of statement, which is apt to be confused with accuracy, and his idol is compactness, not communicability. The

result is as unreadable as it is impractical. Nor has the method proved fruitful in generalization, except in terms of its own axioms. It looks as if an enlightened linguist will in the long run reject assumptions borrowed from psychology, which still has less to offer to linguistics than linguistics can give it in the way of precise and trustworthy data; already the enlightened linguist finds himself more at home in philosophy and mathematics, and this suggests an affinity with Greek founders of grammar — poles apart as they are both in theory and in practice. Robins' book cannot be called stimulating; I find it a mildly interesting account of a congenial intellectual environment, in which many modern linguists would have been seen as what they are — mechanics, not scientists at all.

P. vi. — Is F. R. a misprint for L. R. Palmer? *P. 21.* — For *σημάνει* read *σημαίνει*. *P. 22.* — The use of *μέσον* (Apoll. Dysc. *Synt.* 276. 21) of the reflexive voice ("middle") is analogous to that of τὸ μεταξὺ for "neuter" (gender); but, as Cope pointed out, γένη in Aristotle *Rhet.* 3. 5 is not genders but classes. The term is not apt, for the "neuter" and "reflexive" are neither formally nor categorically "middle," and Robins attempts no justification. Applied to voiced consonants μέσον (Dion. Thr.) was supposed by Delbrück (*Einleitung in das Studium der idg. Sprachen*⁵ [1919], p. 3 — a work that deserved mention in Robins' bibliography) to mean that the increment of voice is intermediate between the two extremes of no increment at all and aspiration. So perhaps it might be argued of voice — intermediate between the extremes of activity and passivity. But this seems highly pedantic, and a stronger case for formal distinctions can be made in the verb (Delbrück, *op. cit.*, p. 11). The use of οὐδέτερον, both of gender and of voice, is ascribed to the Stoics, and it is arguable that Zeno, whose mother-tongue was Phoenician, failed to recognize, on that basis, the true significance of the Greek forms and simply described them as being neither masculine nor feminine, neither

active nor passive. But *μῆσον* is the older name, and therefore cannot be accounted for as a paraphrase of *οὐδέτερον*. The philosophical notion of the indeterminate or intermediate (*μεταξύ τῶν*) appears to be as old as Anaximander, and if the mean, proper to arithmetic, was so pervasive in Greek thought as we are told, its invasion of grammar from philosophy is no cause for wonder.

P. 25. — For "All Greek Stoic philosophers did not teach . . ." read "Not all Greek philosophers taught," etc.

It is edifying to learn (p. 80) that in a work attributed to Albertus Magnus the question "Is grammar a science?" was to be debated.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

Words and Their Use. By STEPHEN ULLMANN. ("Man and Society Series.") New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1951. Pp. 110. \$2.75.

Considered in the most objective manner possible language is a sequence of physical events. Each complete utterance is initiated by the brain from a zero point (silence), there is a conversion of muscular into acoustic energy, articulatory and auditory control of the conversion, that produces a sequence of speech-sounds ranging through frequencies of about 100 to 4000 cycles per second (sound waves) and within a measurable duration, until silence is reached at the end of the utterance. But the events, when they are what we call communicable, i.e., intelligible, are not random. Taken separately as units they constitute a stochastic process, that is the sequence is a system in which the symbols succeed one another according to certain probabilities. This is true whether the symbols are speech sounds, or graphic surrogates ("letters"); and also true whether the units are minimal (phonemes) or the larger segments, free standing and meaningful, commonly called words, which from this point of view are cohesive groups

of phonemes (or graphemes) with strong internal statistical influences. Writing is just as valid a system of expression as talking. Moreover the process is one in which, once it has been initiated, the probabilities depend step-by-step each on the preceding events (i.e., it is a Markoff chain). In other words there is a high degree of determinacy. Now substitute meanings as the units to be calculated. This is the problem of meaning; the meaning of a word in an utterance is one of a complex of possible contextual relationships. It is not a matter of central and peripheral meanings, or of radical and derivative meanings, as the books have it. What we have to find out is the part played by the probabilities of choice in the determinacy of meanings in the sequence of events in an utterance.

Ullmann's book has nothing to say about any of this except in one paragraph on page 80 (cf. p. 82), inserted perhaps at the last minute, which shows that he was aware of the statistical approach, though the work there referred to did not use classical probability. But even as he was writing, the statistical data were being yoked to the calculus probabilities with the result that linguistic problems are *not* now, as hereto, non-mathematical. In a new theory of meaning, which seems to be around the corner, proper account will be taken of the influence of context, which has so far been the stumbling block barring the way to any real advance beyond anecdote, truism, or mere slogans. There is some hope that the method of symbolic logic (axiomatic and logistic) will contribute to the formation of the theory (once the data are systematized), and Ullmann devotes a sentence or two here and there to this procedure, without realizing that the systematization must come first. But I have derived no enlightenment from C. W. Morris' semiotic; and Ogden and Richards, like their disciple Walpole, are concerned with criticism and metaphysics, not with linguistics.

Accordingly the book has a rather old-fashioned air. It is a compact survey of

traditional lore about the meanings of words, in which etymological definition and historical semantic change play the chief part. It never comes to grips with the philosophical problem of meaning, as discussed by Russell, Reichenbach, and von Mises. Ullmann names with respect Korzybski, to whom Dunham's *Man against Myth* (1947) contains a sanitary disinfectant.

Moreover, with some statements there will be sharp disagreement. It is not true (p. 8) that a child learns words "as the first step in his acquisition of language." Symbols are never signs (p. 13); nor are symbols ever natural (p. 13). In de Saussure's system the distinction between *la parole* and *le langage* (or does Ullmann mean *la langue*?) is not quite as stated on page 15. On page 28 (and again on p. 68 and p. 69) there is a lamentable confusion between emotive meaning and emotional discourse, which are by no means the same thing. Everywhere the solecism of referent (for referend) is accepted from Ogden and Richards without a tremor (e.g., p. 31). The referend cannot be "eliminated altogether" (p. 32); to do so is a sort of linguistic self-abuse. Jespersen's notion that "sound imitates" meaning in series of non-onomatopoeic words (p. 40) is contrary to linguistic convention and disproved by the divergent etymologies of the words themselves. On the origin of language Paget is no help (p. 40); the comparative anatomists and neurologists, however, have a more cogent theory about this mystery which I suspect I am the only linguist ever to have read, though it is familiar enough to anthropologists. The decisive factor in translation-loans, namely chronology, is not mentioned on page 49, where it is just as important as on page 63. The load of meaning carried by the frequent words "put," "set," "do" and the like is not high, as the wording on page 49 suggests; these words are neutral and the meaning is carried in the context, which is perhaps what Ullmann means, but not what he says. The trouble with Basic English is not that it increases, but that

it still further decreases, the semantic content of such words. Its redundancy is excessive; cross-word puzzles in Basic English, so far as they are possible at all, would not puzzle an infant in arms, and it is this excessive redundancy that is the reason. Even standard English has a redundancy that rules out three-dimensional cross-word puzzles. It may be doubted that "the number and nature of possible contexts is totally unpredictable" (p. 54): *the dog barked and wagged its tail* assures us that the *hog* (or *fog*, or *frog*, or *bog*, *cog*, *jog*, *log*) *barked and wagged its tail* will not occur (except possibly *fog* in T.S. Eliot). On page 60 for "All these processes do not coin . . ." read "Not all these processes" etc. If there is anything at all that is not certain about language, it is that it is not "handed down discontinuously" (p. 66). It is a relief to see (p. 77) that Professor Hall's revolting "linguistician" (for linguist) has not been heard of in Scotland. On page 93 we are told that "if Aristotle had been a Dakotan, his logic would have been different," and this grotesque fib is announced as a "witticism." If Aristotle had been a Dakotan he would have developed no logic, which is a different matter altogether. Primitive language (Malinowski, p. 99) is a delusion.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine, Tome II: *M-Z et Index*. 3d ed.

By A. ERNOUT and A. MEILLET. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1951. Pp. 668-1385.

P. 668.— Why may not Μακκῶ, μακκῶ-
 νοσις (read μακκ-?), μακκοῶν be South
 Italic? P. 669.— *mācero*, cf. Ven. *ma-*
zello'n: "armarium (?)," Germ. *machio*
 "mason" (Isid. 19. 8. 2.). P. 672.— *ma-*
galia (n. pl.) "huts," cf. *machalum*, *maha-*
lum "shed, barn" in Lex Sal. P. 675.—
magulus. The one occurrence of this word
 (Schol. Iuv. 2. 16) defines it as *cinaedus*;
 cf. therefore Kelt. and Germ. *magu-*
 "youth" (W.-P. 2. 228). The scholia to
 Juvenal have preserved other Keltic and

Germanic words. *P. 696.*— At Petronius 41. 12 Marmorale would read *mattus* which seems to mean “dizzy,” (see my note in *Lg.*, XXV [1949], 391). *P. 714.*— *mettica* (*uitis*) is probably from *Mettis* (i.e., Metz?), which, however, in Fortunatus (7. 4. 16) appears to be a body of water (“de sale nomen habens!”) as well as the city *Mettica moenia* (*idem* 10. 9. 3); but all are in the vicinity of *uivifer Mosella*. *P. 723.*— Ernout has abandoned his former view of *miser* as a loan-word. Yet it has much to commend it. Meillet also was at one time of the opinion that the word was of Mediterranean (i.e., non-I. Eu.) origin; perhaps it and Greek *μισαρός* derive from the same source. That the medial *-s-* was preserved by dissimilation is a most unhappy guess. Latin does not object to *-r-* in contiguous syllables; *rubro-*, *soror*, *rārus*, *properus*, *morigerus*, *marmor*, *ardor*, *cruor*, *Cer-eris*, *rōr-is*, *durior*, *aratrum*, *aurora*, *prora*, *procerus*, *maeror* and many others show that there was no rejection of the pattern *-r...-r-*, even when it came from *-s...-s-* (*aurora*, *maeror*). Thus...*s...r* in *miser*: *μισαρός* is like *siser*: *σίσαρον*. *P. 725.*— The “explanation” of *-tt-* in *mitto* “expressive à consonne intérieure” is feeble; expressive of what? The situation is not at all that of *muttio* and the like.

So much for letter M. The rest are random comments. *P. 848.*— *pando*, *Panda*: the relationship of Oscan *patanaī* raises questions concerning the formation of *pando* not to be dismissed with a mere “pas d'étymologie claire, à moins qu'on ne rapproche *pateo*.” *P. 849.*— *panna* at La Graufesenque is scarcely “de basse époque” (the phrase is carried over from *Thes. Ling. Lat.*). *P. 898* (*s. v. pina*).— Old English has *winewincle* as well as *pinewincle*; but this (the mollusc) has been influenced by O. E. *pervince*, Mid. E. *perwinke*, which is simply the plant-name (Lat. *peruinca*), so that it is questionable whether *pinewincle* is a “Germanic borrowing” of Latin *pin(n)a*. *P. 913.*— *plozenum* needs a cross-reference to *plostrum*. *P. 925.*— Since *pertica* stands for **perctica*

(Osc. *perck*, Umb. *percam*) there seems no objection to connecting *porca* “furrow” with *pertica*; so in Gaulish *arepennis* (*DAG*, 158), properly “the end of a furrow, the point at which the plough is turned round,” came to denote both an area (like *park*, *Pferche*) and a measure of length (given as one-fifth of a stade). As for **rica* (also Gaulish) the word is actually attested in medieval Latin as *riga* (*DAG*, 246), and perhaps in Marcellus of Bordeaux (*ibid.*, Note xxv, Remark). *P. 979.*— under *quattuor* add Gaulish *petuar*, *petuaria* (*DAG*, 95, 158), the latter the same as *framea*, but named from the quadrangular pattern of the shaft at the point where the lance-head was attached, Welsh *pedryollt*; *Petuaria vicus* is also a local name (British, *JRS*, XXVIII [1938], 199. 1); cf. *petru-decameto* (*DAG*, xxix b). *P. 980.*— *-que*, cf. Gaulish *-c* (in etic, La Graufesenque). *P. 992.*— *rachana* is known also from the inscr. *CIL*, XIII, 3162, *DAG*, xxxiv. 2, cf. 220. *P. 1004.*— *religio* is a long standing problem, the best answer to which seems to be that we have conflation of homonyms, the one from *relego* (i.e., *lego*, *λέγω*, *ἀλέγω*), the other from *religo*, and that only the context discriminates. Lucretius favored the latter, Cicero the former content of meaning. *P. 1052.*— for a possible Etruscan origin of *satura* (Etr. *satr*, *satir* “orare”) see Snell in *Stud. Ital. di Filol. Cl.*, XVII (1940), 215–16. *P. 1086.*— add *septemcaulinus* “pygmy,” a Festus gloss published in my *Scholium Vallicelliana* (1926). *P. 1242.*— add *trincus*, *trinquos* “gladiator, swordsman” from Dessau 5163, 9340 (whence **trincare*, Fr. *trancher*). *P. 1293.*— *uibones* (*DAG*, 220) is in all likelihood a Frisian form, see *Germania*, XXIII (1939), 122–23; an inscr. of Haltern (*ibid.*, XII [1928], 70, cf. 75, 172) has *radix britanica*, i.e., the O.E. *wifel*, O.H.G. *uibil*. *P. 1332.*— under *uoueo* note *Postuota* (an epithet of Venus) Serv. *Aen.* 1. 720, where the reading may be correct, since the term is defined “obsequens.” For the formation cf. *obuius*, *profanus* (i.e., a prepositional-phrase compound). *P. 1335.*— *uruum*, *uruo* are per-

haps to be found also in Osc. *urwú* "curua, flexa."

I have not, of course, read the book through; but I shall always consult it.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

Coniectanea: Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der antiken und mittelalterlichen Latinität, Vol. I. By EINAR LÖFSTEDT. Uppsala; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri AB, 1951. Pp. 146.

Löfstedt, now emeritus, continues actively the interests that engaged his years as a teacher — the strict verbal exegesis of Latin texts based on a personal and intimate knowledge. Communication engineers tell us that "interpretation" of a message modifies it to the extent of making recovery of the original forever impossible. This is bad news for the critics. The impossibility of "translation" is more easily demonstrated. A displacement of contextual relationships is inevitable in superimposing one linguistic pattern upon another, and the more you try to "explain" the greater the displacement. Even to read the whole of Latin literature, and Löfstedt seems to have come closer to that than most Latinists try, is not the same as living in the ancient world and talking Latin as your mother-tongue. But to be able to set same or partly same recurrent vocal features side-by-side for comparison is now the only possible substitute for the original environment, and it is Löfstedt's unusual power to do this that makes him a trustworthy guide for his contemporaries. That the original writers would dispute him again and again remains axiomatic.

The essays are rightly called "coniectanea," i.e., a miscellany. What holds them together is the principle that I have just enunciated. They are subdivided as syntactic, stylistic, semantic, and lexical; but these are all one, and the subdivision is a matter of convenience. In time they range from Ennius to the lives of the saints. This

span of time impairs the method, for a language is at best a metastable system, and when it continues to "exist," only by transformation into other tongues, it becomes for a time turbulent. The emergent system or systems may be, and usually are, quite different.

Thus (pp. 7-16) it is the modern editor's "Sprachgefühl" which leads him to rebel at an apparently redundant *sic* or *ita* with a demonstrative or relative. Instead of "emending" it, he should ignore it. A contrasted case is that of *ut* or the like without the antecedent (*eo...ut*) which again most modern European languages expect. A rarely observed meaning (in appropriate contexts) of *plenus* is not "full" but "filling," and similarly *implere* (*uinum, aquam*) "fill the wine (water) to the top," i.e., "fill with wine (water)," and similarly *replere, complere* (pp. 16-20).

The English use of *but* in the sense of *only*, formerly after a negative, now alone ("did she but smile, his heart beat high"), turns up from time to time in late and medieval Latin (*nisi* in the sense of *non nisi*, pp. 28-32). Well may symbolic logic see the inconsistency and frustration of finite minds in negatives! The meaning "other" readily passes into "second" (O.E. has *ōþer*; and also, like late Latin *sequens, æfterra*; Gothic *anþar*), which need not, *pace* Löfstedt, be foreign influence in *alius*; but *alius* in the sense of *quidam* in the life of Columba is no doubt the Irish *araille*, as Plummer saw — it is an Irishism taken over by Andamnan into Latin (p. 49). "Beach" is not the same as "shore," but *litus* has both meanings (p. 84); surely, however, not "ein übersehener Gebrauch."

A few headings, added to these samples, will serve to indicate in brief the kind of tidbit with which Löfstedt stimulates the appetite: *uenire* instead of *reuenire, euenire*; *regere* for *gerere*; *uigor* for *rigor*; a late *talius* gen. of *talis* on the analogy of *illius*; *dieta* "a day's work" or "a day's journey."

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

The Alphabet. By DAVID DIRINGER. Second edition. New York: Philosophical Library [n. d.]. Pp. xii+607. \$12.00.

The Preface to the first edition is dated July 1947, to the second October 1948; a review of the first appeared in *CP*, XLIV, (1949), 265-267. This, of the second, must be brief.

If Dr. Diringer had read all the books he cites he might have learnt that Skeat (*Athenaeum* 8. viii [1908], 159) and Buck (*Modern Philology*, XVII [1919], 43) independently saw the extraordinary similarity between the Runes and the Sub-Alpine (or North Etruscan) alphabets. These are names worthy to be mentioned with Oberziner "and many others," a tail better amputated. He might also have learnt that Vetter's account of the Venetic puncts was anticipated by Thurneysen, Lindsay, and Hempl, but not, so far as I know, by any others. He would not have been content to quote Buonamici on this matter; or the poor authority of Maggiulli and Castromediano, Droop, and Ribezzo for the Messapic texts. Why is the designation of the script of the inscriptions of Belmonte Piceno, Acquaviva, Castignano, Sant' Omero, Bellante, Grecchio, Capestrano and Superaequam as "East Italic" stigmatized as "improper"? And why is "Picenian" substituted? The texts come in part from southern Picenum, but also from the country of the Marrucini, Vestini, and of the Paeligni. Moreover the alphabet of these is not to be confused with that of the inscriptions from Novilara, Fano, and Pesaro. All this, too, is set forth in a work which Dr. Diringer names; but has he read it? Or consulted it?

For Iberian Gómez-Moreno and Cejador y Frauca are named, as if they were of equal merit, without a hint that they differ much as the renowned Bentley and Stoeber. The Harvard library procured a microfilm reproduction of Cejador for my use some years ago. I do not hesitate now to pronounce it worthless. But the important writings of Tovar about Iberian script and language go unmentioned by Diringer.

There is no mention of the role played by the Greek alphabet in the writing of Gaulish inscriptions; or of the curious fact that the consonant cluster [χt] or [ht] from an older *kt* is commonly written in Gaul, even in the Latin alphabet, χt, e.g., *oxtu-meto* "eighth" (cf. Ir. *ocht* "eight", W. *wyth*). This phenomenon appears all over Gaul; there is no possibility whatever of reading *xt* in any word in which the *kt* is etymologically clear. It is, therefore, evident that the Eastern Greek (Ionic) X = χ was taken over into the Latin alphabet to designate a phonematic pattern peculiar to Gaul and the two Germanies (where it appears in Germanic names, which of course show the same shift, cf. O.E. *eahta* "eight").

It seems not to have occurred to Dr. Diringer to ask why the Greek alphabet took *cheth* and not *hē* for the rough breathing. The explanation is that Greek still had the phoneme [χ], not yet [h] initially in words such as ἡμ- "half" (: Latin *semi*-). This is an obvious and important correlate for relative chronology.

The correct reading of the Faliscan inscription on page 505 is *cra* (not *ora*) *carefo*. I have never understood how the Faliscan *f*- sign could be connected, except superficially, "with Phrygia." The statements about *k* and *c* in Faliscan inscriptions on page 506, though correct, are inconsistent with the table in Figure 226 (on p. 502).

The Maria-Saal inscription mentioned on pages 511 and 516 has been proved to be a forgery. I learnt this from Arntz in Copenhagen so long ago as 1936, and the facts are readily available in print. I do not agree with Arntz's theory of the origin of *ogam*, but it is strange to me that Dr. Diringer has failed to put it into his book, unless the reason is that he has not yet heard of it. Arntz published it in the fateful year 1939.

The archaic Latin inscription from Tibur (p. 535) is on a "basis," not on a "vase," *CIL*, I², 2658. And it is Latin, not "Sabine."

In the Preface dated 1948 Dr. Diringer

declares that he has "no first-hand knowledge" of many matters with which he deals. I do not know in what field he would claim to speak with authority, if any. His book has the blessing of Sir Ellis Minns and of M. N. Tod; but that does not alter my opinion that it is a compilation. In the parts of it devoted to scripts of which I have first-hand knowledge I find that it must be used with caution. After all, any one may consult *CAH* and the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* for himself, if he finds that kind of work adequate to his needs.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

Euripide, Vol. V: *Hélène; Les Phéniciennes*. Edited and translated by HENRI GRÉGOIRE and LOUIS MÉRIDIER, with the collaboration of FERNAND CHAPOUTHIER. Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1950. Pp. 227+double pages 47-120, 150-226.

There are, perhaps, few human enterprises so dangerous by their very nature as the editing of Euripides. In Aeschylus certain restoration is usually past hope; in Sophocles the rules are (at least in part) known and strict, and the prizes are consequently few. But in Euripides any man with imagination and energy may hope to make a name for himself. Not many, it is true, have attained more than a faint notoriety in the pastime, but there is always, we are told, room at the top; though the few who have attained this eminence carefully refrain from verifying this unkind rumor.

There are not, moreover, many occupations which provide an education so harrowing. To live with the textual problems, no less than the spiritual content, of Euripides is to realize that anything can happen to anyone, and that it frequently does. If the problem of translating him is uncomfortable to the point of torture, the *ratio et res ipsa* of constructing his supposed text is enough to certify a conscientious man for Bedlam.¹ The point at

which one must arrive is far from cheering, but the condition of his remains makes it quite clear: a certified version of the dramatist is as impossible as is one of Homer or Menander or Catullus. We never possess, even at the best, more than a composite of some ancient guesses; the wretched condition of the lyrics and the shameless interpolations in the dialogue both prove this again and again. To Grégoire (G.), then, we may be grateful for a new and rather exciting version of the *Helen*, though it goes without saying that it could not be half so exciting as Campbell's (C.), which preceded it by a few months. If Euripides himself might be surprised at what G. sometimes writes, he would be astounded by C. (and occasionally, perhaps, a little flattered).

The contrast that meets us when we turn from G. to Chapouthier's revision of Méridier's *Phoenissae* (M-C.) need not startle, for we are more used to Euripides dead than alive. Under French protection we are almost lulled into believing that texts are good² and that Athenian dramatists belonged to an authors' guild which guaranteed both purity and preservation. Of course the collocation of editors is unfair to both parties, depending as it does upon the reader's temperament: excitement and routine are not compatible fellows. G. is zealous in the collection of testimonia; his footnotes dump unnoticed parallels and explanations into our startled, though appreciative, laps. M-C. are, on the whole, a shade dull and pedestrian: their text might just as well have issued from the fonts of Ginn and Co. or from any establishment dedicated to the perpetuation of the sacred tradition of the received text. But some of us are grateful for G. at his most playful, even though he is not always at his most thoughtful or dependable.

2. Though M-C may not be so complaisant as they seem: the Introduction attests several passages printed in the text without apparent scruple. The fact that the *Phoenissae* and the *Helen* belong to different traditions (*Auswahl* and *Alphabetisches* in Wilamowitzian terms) is here of secondary importance, for they were both atrociously interpolated in antiquity. And this M-C know (p. 204, n. 3), though they often neglect to apply their knowledge.

1. Or for the Antipodes: Housman, *Manilius* I, xlii.

When the whole truth is *ex hypothesi* irrecoverable, any shot may be into the light. Housman claimed that his art³ was a science; well, so is lip-reading. But remove the mouth a few thousand years and you have the uncertain accent of the Euripidean lyric.

It is a complaint frequently launched against Gallic scholarship that it takes good account of itself, but of not very much else of less subtle provenience. Fancy, for instance, G. citing Simeterre (*REG*, LVIII [1945], 146 ff.) for the chronology of Plato! All that Simeterre does and all that he professes to do is to synthesize (neatly, though not very critically) the results of others. No wonder that G. tells us first that Isocrates' *Helen* was written shortly after 390 B.C. (p. 28, n. 1), and then (four pages later) that it appeared shortly after the publication of the *Phaedrus* and *Republic* 9. No wonder that M-C. have not heard of J. U. Powell or of D. L. Page and that none of the editors has heard of Jachmann.

And now for details: G. might have learned from Dingelstad (*De Eur. Hel.*, p. 48f.) that the scene is not laid in Pharos and that line 5 is interpolated.

Helen, line 59: — see Tucker, *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, XVI (1887), 3.

l. 78: — there is surely a lacuna after this line.

ll. 83-88: — Badham and Page (*Actors' Interpol.*, p. 79) make an agreeable combination. G. emends l. 90, but this does not help.

l. 136: — Is G.'s lacuna likely? *Helen's* lament would break up the stichomythia; besides, it comes below in ll. 164ff., 200ff., 280ff., which is quite enough.

l. 150: — see F. W. Schmidt, *Krit. Stud.*, II, 104 and C.'s remarks.

ll. 164/5: — Wecklein should have been followed. G. is not at his best in the lyrics, which will not be treated further in this notice.

ll. 257/9: — Badham is probably right after all.

ll. 280/1: — "To print these two lines as they appear in the tradition argues a very

strange conception of what was possible for E. — or indeed for anyone normally capable of thought and speech" (C.). Yet G. does so and Murray and Terzaghi and Pearson and Italic and many, many others.

l. 286 and the like: — Solmsen, *CR*, XLVIII (1934), 119ff.

ll. 299/302: — "male damnaverunt" (G.); "ejected by Hartung" ... I cannot conceive why" (C.). One reason is that ll. 299/300 are scarcely possible after ll. 136 and 200, not to mention 686.

ll. 388/9: — C. stubbornly emends, but G. wisely deletes; cf. Jachmann, *Binneninterpol.*, p. 185; Strohm, *Gnomon*, XXII (1950), 307. G. further emends (cf. *Phoen.* l. 945), but Hermann's reading seems better.

l. 426: — a reference to Denniston (*Gk. Part.*, p. 502) might have modified G.'s impatience with Hermann, and also C.'s glibness.

ll. 433/4: — should probably be deleted, not emended. They were added by a confused person who did not understand the construction of l. 432.

l. 577: — "The fact that in A.D. 1949 I can apparently get away with an elementary correction like this..." (C.).⁵ But G. is not convinced.

l. 578: — C. believes in Badham and himself, but G. sticks by Seidler.

ll. 591/2: — C. praises l. 593, but does not observe that it is the answer to l. 590. Delete the intruded lines.

l. 713: — G. fails to observe the necessary lacuna.

l. 747: — Denniston, *op. cit.*, pp. 510, 511.

l. 764: — "mais les amis toujours ont le désir d'entendre le récit du malheur qui frappa les amis" (G.). That is the sort of nonsense that one edits Euripides to eliminate. It was again the construction of l. 763 which prompted the stupid explanation.

l. 772: — whatever one may think of this, l. 780 cannot stand (Valckenaer). Even C. puts it before l. 778: his whole series of emendations and rearrangements of this passage merely expose the interpolator's hand.

l. 785: — Both G. and C. emend, and with

4. W. Lamowitz (*Anal. Eur.*, p. 242) gives the credit to Lightfoot.

5. He thus openly flouts Dodd's Law of Diminishing Returns (*Bacchae*, p. liii, n. 1).

3. "This art, once the Cynosure, is now fast on its way to become the Cinderella of classical studies" (C.).

- what a difference! G. escapes the charge of rape only by a mistranslation.
- ll. 840/1: — these are passed without remark; but if the interpolator had had Musgrave to help him, he would not have written as he did.
- l. 844: — "Celui qui veut ravir ma femme, qu'il approche!" (G). A little meditation on the appropriateness of this sentiment might help to eliminate it.
- l. 854: — the dubious credit for $\xi\phi'$ is to be given to Terzaghi of whom G. does not appear to have heard.
- ll. 892/3: — neither editor sees that these lines are quite impossible; and they both waste their time defending or emending l. 905.
- l. 936: — it would be difficult to say which editor struggles hardest to prop up the nonsense: delete at least ll. 935/7 and probably more. On the other hand C., but not G., takes the difficulties of ll. 973/4 to heart. G. actually prints the unmetrical l. 974 without comment. The solution may be something like:
- ἢ τῆνδ' ἀνάγκασόν γ' [εὐσεβοῦς πατρός
κρείσσω φανείσων] ἐμοὶ δοῦναι λέχην.
- l. 1008: — "And I shall try to remain a virgin for ever.' Well, certainly, there is nothing like trying." (C., however, goes on in Verrall's [*Four Plays*, p. 79] manner to defend it, while G. again takes refuge in mistranslation.)
- ll. 1051/2: — Italie's conjectures are worth considering.
- l. 1074: — for Maas' fine emendation see also Jackson, *CQ*, XXXV (1941), 186.
- l. 1104: — "les philtres qui de sang remplissent les demeures" (G.). As C. would say, a neat trick.
- ll. 1214/17: — once again C.'s elaborate rearrangement and emendations (together with Musgrave's splendid try) merely reveal that ll. 1215/16 are interpolated. In l. 1214 Theoclymenus asks an awkward question which Helen must parry. But l. 1217 was too clever a rejoinder for the discepuasts (or the actors). "Truly the world is full of snares," says C. with a sigh; "but 1215-16 as they stand certainly represent for me the most insidious interpolation I have ever found or expect to find." It is at least true that the editing of Euripides calls for special prayers.
- l. 1225: — G. again evades the difficulties; C. creates others.
- ll. 1229/30: — G. should consult Jackson, *CQ*, XXXV (1941), 50.
- l. 1372: — C.'s emendation is very clever indeed.
- l. 1485: — G. probably mistranslates and C. misunderstands: see Denniston p. 514. We possess one advantage over Euripides: we have Denniston.
- l. 1512: — this is still wholly unsatisfactory, as are ll. 1534/6. The latter may be interpolated with the help of *IT* ll. 1345ff.; here they will not do: see l. 1612.
- ll. 1563/4: — perhaps
ἐς πρόφραν ἐμβαλεῖτε [φάσγανόν θ' ἄμα
πρόχειρον ὡσει σφάγια] τῷ τεθνηκότι;
If so, the intruded words are parts of two stage directions, or explanations.
- ll. 1667/8: — for once C. relents and deletes; G. remains unmoved. See Jachmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 192 ff.
- l. 1679: — Madvig's wonderful emendation (*Adv. Crit.*, I, 238) sets all to rights, as C. sees.
- ll. 1682/3: — Pearson's athetesis should be followed.
- The M-C. *Phoenissae* must be dealt with more briefly: Scarcely an edition of the preceding century could tolerate ll. 27 or 1370/1. M-C. are not alone in swallowing all three; Pearson and Powell do the same.
- l. 11: — this must go; see l. 47.
- l. 60: — del. Valckenaer: cf. Jachmann, *op. cit.*, p. 195.
- ll. 141/4: — M-C. think that all is well if they take out l. 143. There is no comment on l. 372. The questions in ll. 376/8 are not answered: why are they asked?
- l. 399: — Jackson, *op. cit.*, 180.
- l. 548: — is unmetrical.
- ll. 555/8: — E. Fraenkel, *Eranos Rudberg* (1947), pp. 81ff. (cf. Page, p. 29).
- ll. 623/4: — seem to be inspired by the actors' natural desire to keep a good three-cornered scene rolling a little longer; and ll. 728/9 are worse and so are ll. 763/5. And how are ll. 838/40 possible for a blind man? The scholia (p. 341, Schwartz) try to remove the difficulty by making a seeress of Antigone! And those who rely on Pearson to explain ll. 847/8 are walking in a worse than Teiresian darkness. Once again l. 878 is unmetrical and most of l. 879 comes from l. 1331.
- ll. 886/8 are very strange and the first of them comes from l. 904. μ^2 in l. 890 will then be οὐκ. ll. 1015/18 spoil the climax of Menoeceus' speech.⁶
6. In so far as these pronouncements are merely those of the reviewer, they will be defended and expanded else-

- l. 1029: — see Denniston, p. 502.
 ll. 1104-40 and 1221-63: — see Powell (pp. 11ff.) and Page (pp. 21ff.)
 l. 1136: — correctly described by Murray and Page as a dittograph of l. 1135.
 ll. 1183/5: — M-C. may, for once, be rejecting too much: see Page (p. 25).
 l. 1252: — if M-C. really want a future, why do they not write ὑπερμαχεῖ? See Soph. OT 265.
 l. 1313: — see Denniston (p. 536) and Pearson.
 l. 1360: — del. Valekenaeer (cf. 1243).
 ll. 1361/2: — write perhaps
 ἔστησαν ἐλθόντ' ἐς μέσον [μεταίχμιον
 δισσω στρατηγῶ καὶ διπλῶ] στρατηλάτα
 ll. 1463/7: — it is not unlikely that these lines should be rejected, as well as ll. 1478/9. Note the strange accumulation of οἱ μὲν . . . δέ's and ὡς's from l. 1461 on.
 It is unnecessary to discuss ll. 1582- (or even ll. 1539-) end.

Chapouthier has a special interest in art which provides occasional and admirable illustrations.

W. C. HELMBOLD

University of California,
Berkeley

The Monuments of Ancient Rome. By DOROTHY M. ROBATHAN. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 1950. Pp. 211 + 3 maps + 16 pls.

During the last three decades continuous excavations in Rome have lead to remarkable and important archeological discoveries. To give an account of these recent finds Miss Robathan has written *The Monuments of Ancient Rome* to supplement the work of Platner's *Ancient Rome*, now far out of date, and to provide material in a handy form on the buildings of the ancient city, more easily available than in the Platner-Ashby's large *Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (London, 1929). The hope is expressed that such a volume, written without too many technical details, may prove useful in courses in

where. On M-C, p. 196, n. 1: the tone of the messenger's speech (ll. 1090ff.) implies that Jocasta already had learned (off stage) of Menoeceus' death; her feelings about a mere nephew cannot, at this point, be emphasized in a play already overcharged with emotion.

classical civilization as well as for supplementary reading in classes in Roman literature, and that it may likewise serve the needs of visitors to post-war Rome who may want more information than the usual guide books provide. Such a purpose is to be commended highly. Platner's standard work is badly in need of revision, and material to be used by undergraduates in classical courses in this country and visitors abroad must be handled simply and informally. The book starts directly with an account of our sources of information on the topography of the city, and an introduction to the building materials used in the construction of the monuments to be described. It then proceeds to a good, systematic discussion of the historical development of the city archeologically and of the buildings in the various regions of the city: the Palatine, the Forum, the *Via dei Fori Imperiali*, the Colosseum, the Arch of Constantine, the *Passeggiata Archeologica* and the *Via Appia*, the Esquiline, the Caelian, the Aventine and the Circus Maximus, the Campus Martius, the Capitoline, the *Via del Teatro di Marcello*, the *Forum Boarium* and *Velabrum*, the Quirinal, the Viminal and the Pincian, and ends with a short treatment of the monuments, Transtiber. An index enables the reader to find any single monument, and three maps and sixteen plates complete the format of the volume. By and large the material is well handled, and the book is lively and decidedly readable. Certain suggestions, however, for the greater usefulness of such a volume come to mind. These points may indicate the means to accomplish more completely the purpose for which Miss Robathan has written.

The first essential of a guide of this kind is a set of first rate maps, designed to provide a clear picture of the monuments discussed both in their proper plans and orientation and in their relation to each other. The first map of the imperial *fora* is excellent. The second of the Roman Forum and Palatine is disappointing in its lack of clarity. It should have been reproduced on a much larger scale to enable the reader to

follow it and the text readily. The third map of ancient and modern Rome is inadequate for the same reason, lack of clarity owing to the small size of the reproduction, and secondly, because such important "new" monuments as the temples in the *Largo Argentina* are not even indicated, though they are discussed at length in the text.

A second *desideratum* even for the most casual visitor to Rome, all too innocent of a knowledge of source material, or for the college undergraduate, is a general bibliography. Lugli's work, for example, is a most important source on which Miss Robathan has drawn for *il centro monumentale di Roma*, and a brief reference to his *Roma Antica* (Rome, 1946) as well as to such a standard work in English as the *Topographical Dictionary* would have enabled the curious reader to pursue investigations further. It may be argued, of course, that such a volume does not require any bibliography, indeed is better off without it; yet when the most general bibliography is entirely lacking, the reader is left with a distinct sense of disappointment in the face of "according to the most recent theory, there were two temples dedicated to the Emperor Augustus" (p. 72), or apropos of eight medallions on the Arch of Constantine, "They were once assigned to the Flavian period, but current opinion supports a Hadrianic date" (p. 108).

Thirdly, for a volume of this type, the author might have included more material of an interpretative nature. The average visitor to Rome, as well as the beginner in topography in this country, is constantly concerned with the significance of the buildings with which he is dealing, the purposes for which they were used. That is part of "general education" in the ancient world. Miss Robathan, to be sure, has done an adequate amount in this direction, but even more would have added greatly to the usefulness of this volume. For example, something of the ceremony, described by Livy and Ovid, attendant upon the arrival of the black stone from Phrygia for the Temple of the *Magna Mater* would have

enhanced the meaning of momentous character of this event in Roman history at the time of the Punic Wars (p. 33). Or, to cite another instance, how would a person meeting the *Ara Pacis* for the first time be familiar with the "well known Tellus mater relief"? It, too, deserved further discussion (p. 151). In addition, for the student of ancient literature the connections between the monuments and the authors could have been expanded. If Juvenal's third satire and Propertius' elegies have a place in this text, as they very rightly have, shouldn't more have been done with the eighth book of Virgil's *Aeneid* in connection with Hercules and the *Forum Boarium*, and the whole archeological walk of Evander and Aeneas on the site of primeval Rome? This is the kind of link between literature and archeology which makes the monuments of ancient Rome live for the student of Rome today and would serve well the purpose which Miss Robathan has mentioned in her Introduction. The author has wisely left technical terms at a minimum, but certain names such as "Vejove" needed further explanation. In connection with this strange divinity the recent excavations of his temple on the Capitoline are of paramount importance and described concisely (pp. 175-76). A glance at the Index shows he is cited only here. It is necessary, therefore, to hunt elsewhere in the volume to discover anything of his nature. On page 18 he is mentioned apropos of his sanctuary on the island in the Tiber as anciently conceived as a "bad Jove"; and on page 181 in a discussion of the Temple of Apollo near the theater of Marcellus as the Greek Apollo. Yet the reader is left in bewilderment as to his nature on the Capitoline at his most important center of worship.

It would be ungrateful to demand more than is reasonably feasible in a volume of this sort. But these comments are made in the hope that in a new edition of this very useful guide to ancient Rome certain slight changes could be introduced to make this book even more useful and to fulfill more adequately the purpose for which it was

written. It promises to be the handiest volume on the subject available in English for some time to come.

ELIZABETH C. EVANS

Vassar College

Opuscula selecta, linguis Anglica, Franco-gallica, Germanica conscripta, Vol. I.

By MARTIN P. NILSSON. ("Acta instituti Atheniensis regni Sueciae," Series in 8^o, II: 1.) Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1951. Pp. iv + 456; 11 figs. Sw. Cr. 45.

Collections of the *Opuscula* of great scholars are among the most useful of books, and this one has the special advantages of representing Nilsson's own choice among his papers down to the end of 1939 and of including his revisions and additions. A full discussion of the contents of the first volume (entitled *Ad historiam religionis graecae*) would run to great length and a brief word of heartfelt gratitude must suffice. All these papers have stood the test of time. Perhaps the finest are that on gods and psychology in Homer, that on the early history of Christmas observances¹, and that on the origin of tragedy. Yet everything here is excellent; the review of Robert's *Oidipus* is a small masterpiece.

Throughout there is the same unhurried and courageous wisdom, the same breadth of knowledge and vision, the same sense of balance, the same clearly articulated structure of thought². You never have to ask yourself what the writer is trying to

prove; he never talks around a subject; he is never irrelevant, never obscure; *non fumum ex fulgore sed ex fumo dare lucem*. Again, the agrarian basis of ancient religion and the strength of tradition derived therefrom is something which Nilsson has in his blood and not only in his brains; he can share the feelings of Hesiod and of Hesiod's audience, without any lack of sympathetic understanding of Plato and Plato's audience. So it is that, while ancient life may not in this or that respect have been such as Nilsson infers, it certainly could have been; he never gives us houses of cards, combinations of facts and fancies from *fiches* which prove an author's ingenuity but nothing else.

A second volume, with a select bibliography and an index, is to follow and will be eagerly awaited. It too will deserve a wide circle of readers — and readers who will not fail to turn constantly to papers and critiques of Nilsson which are not reprinted; even his briefest reviews contain valuable and original observations. May he long be spared to make yet more of his unrivalled contributions to our knowledge of ancient belief and thought, indeed of belief and thought in general!

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK

Harvard University

Cicero: De inventione; De optimo genere oratorum; Topica. English Translation by H. M. HUBBELL ("Loeb Classical Library," No. 386). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949. Pp. xviii + 468 + 8. \$3.00.

In spite of the disparaging reference to his *Jugendarbeit* made by Cicero later in life (*De oratore* 1. 2. 5), *De inventione* is an important work both in itself as a representative treatise on Hellenistic rhetoric, and because of the influence that it exercised in literature and education for many centuries. An English translation based on a text bearing the fruits of the scholarship of the last hundred years was badly needed. A comparison between

1. On the discussion here given (pp. 248ff.) of the *Acta S. Dasii* I would remark that Delehayé has made a strong case for the view that the story here set forth of human sacrifice to Kronos is not an original part of the martyr's story but a literary embellishment added by the writer (*Les passions des martyrs*, pp. 321ff.; *Acta Sanctorum*, Dec. *Propyl.* 536). Human sacrifice in a Roman camp is to me unthinkable (cf. Delehayé, *Passions*, p. 324f.); the writer, in his passionate desire to attack the surviving observance of *Kalendae Ianuariae*, is concerned to blacken paganism and to this end uses some record of the Sacaia. For other Christian misstatements about paganism, cf. H. J. Rose, *Mnemos.*, LV (1927), 273ff. and my remarks in *J. Theol. St.*, XXVIII (1927), 411f., *Gnomon*, IV (1928), 486, n. 2, *Vig. Christ.* III (1949), 48. [See now Nilsson, *Opusc.*, II, 1057.]

2. Cf. G. Pasquali's beautiful Introduction to Nilsson, *Fondamenti di scienza delle religioni* (Florence, 1950).

Hubbell's version and the only other published English version, by C. D. Yonge (1852), will make the point clear. And not only with regard to the basic Latin text. Hubbell, interpreting technical matter often difficult to turn, gives us a skilful and smooth rendering, and — in harmony with Cicero's aim in his own translations as set forth in one of these essays (*De opt. gen. orat.* 5. 14) — "in language that conforms with our usage." Some of the Latin terms were themselves not altogether successful translations from the Greek; for example, in one of these very essays (*Top.* 24. 92) Cicero expresses his annoyance at the term *irudicialis*, a neologism of the time intended to render δικάζομαι. The doctrine of Issues (to which a large portion of *De inventione* is devoted) was at home in Greek rhetoric, where it originally reflected Attic legal procedure; the Roman rhetoricians made it their business to adapt the principles as well as they could to Roman conditions. To find adequate English equivalents for some of the terms when exact analogies in Anglo-American procedure do not exist presents even greater difficulties; *translatio* (= the Issue, pp. 33 and 219ff.) may serve as an example. So if Hubbell omits to translate *purgatio* (pp. 31 and 261), his caution is to be respected. And not only the "legal" terms pose a problem; it is perhaps just as well that Hubbell also let *argumentum* (p. 55, = διήγημα πλασματικόν) stand without translation. Inevitably another's renderings would differ from Hubbell's, but it is doubtful that they would be accepted as improvements. I only offer "Indirect Approach" or "Subtle Approach" in place of "Insinuation" (pp. 43ff.), and should, to render *elocutio* (pp. 19 and 21), choose "Style" as against "Expression," which suggests certain attributes of Delivery — but Hubbell does indeed elsewhere (pp. 56, 211, and 463) resort to "Style."

The same excellence characterizes Hubbell's translation of *De optimo genere oratorum*, an essay sometimes obscure in style but not without value for the literary

criticism it contains, and of *Topica*, a treatise which students of dialectic and of rhetoric set store upon. It is always interesting to mark the attitude, at times superior, of the advocate Cicero towards the profession of juriconsult. Cicero is here (*Top.* 12. 51) proud to report that Gaius Aquilius Gallus, when anyone brought him a case which turned on an issue of fact, used to say: "That is not a matter for the *Law*, but for Cicero." In *Topica* Cicero writes for all concerned: the *orator* and *philosophus* and *iuriconsultus*.

Only points most in need of explanation are selected for treatment in the Notes. These are always useful, and make one wish that it had been possible to add to their number. For example, a note at *De inventione* 2. 50. 148-49 would have reminded the reader that the laws there considered belong to the Twelve Tables, and one at 1. 14. 19 that Cicero is there misconstruing *firmamentum* (cf. *Part. orat.* 29. 103).

For *De inventione* Hubbell's text is essentially that of Stroebel's admirable edition, but differs from it in a number of places. An examination of the divergences shows that Hubbell accepts several readings in the manuscript transmission which Stroebel regards as interpolations. The text of the other two essays is based on the apparatus supplied by various modern editions. Hubbell's taste is conservative but also judicious; his own emendation, *instituti* (*Top.* 10. 44), and his acceptance of Hendrickson's *tolerabilis . . . optimus* (*De opt. gen. orat.* 2. 6), Parker's *ambitus* (*Top.* 4. 24), and Martha's conjecture in *De inventione* 1. 4. 5 should meet with approval.

The few slips I have caught are none of them serious: the title of Herbolzheimer's article on page xvi is incomplete; I should prefer plural verbs in the last sentence of page 161; and *ex scriptiois ratione* at *De inventione* 2. 40. 116 I think means "from textual considerations" rather than "from the nature of writing."

HARRY CAPLAN

Cornell University

Storia della letteratura latina, Vol. II: *L'Impero*. By AUGUSTO ROSTAGNI. Torino: Unione tipografica editrice, 1952. Pp. xvi+784+442 figs.+12 pls. L.7400.

This volume, the companion-piece to that on the Republic published in 1949 and reviewed in *CP*, XLVI (1951), 241 to 242, is on the same lavish scale of text, with ample illustrations, the latter reproducing busts, statues, reliefs, coins, inscriptions, wall-paintings, landscapes (e.g., three of the Licenza valley), pages of manuscripts, illustrated title-pages of early editions, and a variety of other material. The treatment of the various authors is, in general, well balanced, though the author's own interests in the *Corpus Tibullianum* (28 pages as contrasted with 15 on Propertius) have led to a possible overemphasis there, while Mela and Columella receive less attention than even they deserve. In contrast to the great fulness with which certain works of Seneca are treated (36 pages) it seems inadequate to crowd the *Naturales Quaestiones*, *Epistulae*, and *Dialogi* into fifteen lines on pages 369-70. The style of Tacitus and Sallust's influence upon it is insufficiently emphasized (p. 548); in fact, the *Fortleben* of ancient writers — at least after the classical period — is largely neglected. On the other hand, Rostagni is particularly careful to give us, for each period or subperiod, sections dealing with the historical background and the relation of individual authors to the social and political conditions of their time, and for each major author a chapter on his *Formazione*. (One wonders whether his great and constant emphasis upon *libertas*, tyrannicides, and senatorial opposition under the Caesars may in part derive from memories of recent Italian history, though no names are here mentioned.)

Ideas of some interest are (p. 10) the likeness in style between the *Monumentum Ancyranum* and Caesar's *Commentaries* (despite the shift from third to first person); the view that Horace really stems from the neoteric school (p. 113); Ovid as

essentially a systematic poet (p. 177); Manilius as a literary heir of Virgil in dealing with the question of fate; Lucan as a precursor of the romantics (p. 397); and the contrast between the psychologically interested Valerius Flaccus and the geographically minded Apollonius Rhodius (p. 473). Positions taken on various controversial matters include the identification of Andes with Pietole (p. 71); the *Catalepton*, *Culex*, and *Ciris* as the parts of the *Appendix Vergiliana* most likely to be authentic (p. 37); the priority of Horace's sixteenth *Epode* to Virgil's fourth *Eclogue* (pp. 44, 112); acceptance of the fourth *Georgic* as originally ending with the praise of Gallus (p. 73; against the view of Norden); the Tibullan authorship of the *Panegyric on Messalla* (p. 137); an ignoring of the possibility that Livy's *Patavinitas* may have been only a matter of brogue (p. 207); a suggestion that the *Octavia* may have been written by L. Annaeus Cornutus (p. 379); the assignment of Curtius to the period of Caligula and Claudius (p. 325); and Martianus Capella as in many respects the heir of the "chaotic literary and philosophic culture of Apuleius."

The bibliographies added after each chapter are helpful, though at times needing additions, e.g. (p. 73), H. J. Rose, *The Eclogues of Vergil* (1942); the works of Deipser in 1881 and Daniells in 1906 on the relation of Statius to Virgil at page 483; and the edition of the Hermetic *Asclepius* by Festugière and Nock should now be cited at page 635. There seem to be more misprints than in the first volume, and these often affect proper names: Burriss (for Burriss, p. 156); J. W. Lenz (read F. W. Lenz, p. 205); for E. Fränkel on page 205 read H. F. Fränkel; on page 238 Marsh not Marsch; page 502 E. T. Sage (not Stage); page 579 J. C. Rolfe (not F. C. Rolfe); page 599 Rostovtzeff (not Rostovzeff); page 691 Souter (not Sauter); page 704 Harvard (not Harward). Misspelled or inaccurate titles occur on pages 272 (*bis*), 503, 650, 693; a misquotation of Virgil on page 161; and

wrongly spelled single words on pages 206, 296, 442, 457, 493, 494, and 678. *Verum operi longo fas est obrepere somnum*. And this is, after all is said, a distinctly good work.

But let no one select this book to read in bed. Testing it, Aristophanes-wise, on the butcher's scales, I find it to weigh five pounds.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

Harvard University

Quintus Serenus (Serenus Sammonicus) Liber Medicinalis. Edited and Translated by R. PÉPIN. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1950. Pp. xlviii + 121 + double pp. 6-56. Fr. 600.

The major distinction of the *Liber Medicinalis* is historical rather than therapeutic, in that the book represents a bridge between the medical thought of antiquity and the practices of the Middle Ages. It was composed early in the third century A.D. by Quintus Serenus Sammonicus; this much is known, although it has been a matter of long and unresolved debate whether the authorship is to be attributed to father or son of that name. The elder Serenus, who was put to death by Caracalla, is reported to have been "a learned writer and the owner of a library of 62,000 volumes." While the extent of the Serenus library may be somewhat exaggerated, there is little doubt that it did contain the works of Pliny and Dioscurides, which form the basis of the contents of the *Liber Medicinalis*. Apart from these two sources, little can be discovered in the book that is reminiscent of the medical and medico-philosophical achievements and the critical insight of antiquity.

In form the *Liber Medicinalis* is a didactic poem of 1105 hexameters, probably intended as a formulary for home use. It consists of sixty-five chapters, forty-two of which discuss bodily disorders in the sequence *a capite ad calcem*; both this sequence and the poetic form attained high favor with later medical writers. The remaining twenty-three chap-

ters deal with various disorders, including dislocations, lethargy, jaundice, epilepsy, hemorrhoids, insomnia and poisoning. In each case Serenus recommends a remedy; sometimes it is one which modern medical science would recognize as beneficial, but as often as not it is the kind of unappetizing concoction of more than doubtful value that somewhat later became an accepted part of the medieval pharmacopeia.

The book's peculiar linkage of ancient mythology and medieval superstition is exemplified in the *prefatio* and in the chapter dealing with intermittent fever. In the Preface the author addresses himself to Apollo, the discoverer of the art of healing, and calls upon him to extend his patronage to the medical poem. He then turns to Asklepios and assures him of his endeavour to present within the "fragile" pages of the poem the sum total of the god's doctrine. In treatment, however, this obeisance to the gods of old is supplanted by faith in an amulet made by writing the magical formula "Abra-cadabra" a number of times in a specific pattern.

From the above summary of its contents it should be fairly evident that the *Liber Medicinalis* contains very little of medical or philosophical value. Nevertheless, the poem was widely read in succeeding centuries, and exerted a considerable impact on subsequent medical literature. It served as a pattern in form and content for a hexametric poem on therapy composed late in the seventh century by Benedetto Crispo, archbishop of Milan, and had a decided influence on Walafrid Strabo, abbot of Reichenau, who wrote a poem of 444 hexameters about the healing effects of the herbs in his monastery garden. References to Serenus' work can be found in medical literature up to the eighteenth century.

The influence of the *Liber Medicinalis* and the fact that it may be regarded as a legacy of Latin poetry may serve to explain why so much time and talent have been devoted to the many excellent edi-

tions, commentaries and discussions of the poem preceding the French translation and edition here discussed, and why Dr. Pépin should have felt called upon to add his own labors to those of his predecessors.

Dr. Pépin has based his translation on a careful collation and selection of existing editions, with uniformly excellent results. His introductory chapter, devoted to a discussion of historical, bibliographical and textual problems in the study of Seneca, reveals thoroughly competent scholarship, which finds further confirmation in the exhaustive nature of his documentation and annotation. Thus, while this new edition does not and cannot shed much new light upon either the *Liber Medicinalis* or its author, medical history must nevertheless be indebted to Dr. Pépin for bringing together and giving continuity to all the material that is dispersed and out of print, and for making available in a modern language a work that has — deservedly or not — had a profound influence on the course of medieval medicine.

ILZA VEITH

University of Chicago

Rom, das Reich und die fremden Völker in der Geschichtsschreibung der frühen Kaiserzeit: Studien zur Glaubwürdigkeit des Tacitus. By GEROLD WALSER. Baden-Baden: Verlag für Kunst und Wissenschaft, 1951. Pp. 183.

We all have admired and profited by the keen work done in the last two or three decades by Marsh, Rogers, and others on the history of the early Empire and especially on Tacitus' part in the description of it. The methods by which Tacitus long imposed on his readers in describing the reign of Tiberius are now generally understood.

Walser undertakes to extend the inquiry to other parts of Tacitus' work. He starts by systematically proving what the attentive reader of Tacitus must feel, that Tacitus' main interest is Rome and that his

mind does not readily assume any other point of view than that of the Roman senator in opposition. Even though Tacitus accepts the inevitability of the principate, he still can have the opposition point of view.

Walser discusses the *Agricola* and *Germania* and all the sections on foreign affairs in the *Annals* and *Histories*. He comes to the conclusion that all Tacitus' studies of dealings with peoples on the periphery of the Empire lose greatly in value because of a double misunderstanding on Tacitus' part. First, Tacitus uncritically takes up a trait of earlier historical work, the discussion of Rome's relations with opposing peoples as cultural equals (as were the Hellenistic Greeks) who are equipped to carry on a vigorous polemic against Roman imperialism. The speech of Calgacus, for instance, is written as if the British chief were well acquainted with Roman history and with the fate of Rome's earlier adversaries. Second, Tacitus takes the point of view of what has been called geographical primitivism, the theory of the "noble savage." The less civilized peoples with whom Rome dealt are represented as virtuous and manly and devoted to "freedom."

In a great many passages of his detailed discussion Walser shows that Tacitus, although he was in possession, or could easily have been in possession, of facts on which he could have based a sound account, preferred to ignore or to pervert those facts in order to construct an account which would correspond to the point of view with which he started. We should be able to assume, for instance, that Tacitus could have gotten from his father-in-law or from his reports a good account of the condition of Britain and of Agricola's campaigns and administration. His biography of Agricola, however, gives no adequate idea of the state of the country nor of the campaigns nor of the administration. Instead it gives in the most general terms a laudatory account of Agricola as a fine governor full of old Roman virtues pleasantly contrasting with the character

of Domitian. The provincials are likewise caricatured as noble savages resisting Roman imperialism.

One result of this study will be to shake the belief that Tacitus was a master of psychology. Perhaps by now many scholars prefer to phrase it as "a master of psychological *description*." Walser concludes that Tacitus knew next to nothing about the psychology of the peoples on the periphery, and hardly cared to know anything. He also concludes that the pictures of such men as Agricola, Corbulo, and Germanicus are not real pictures, but are thrown badly out of drawing by Tacitus' presuppositions.

Since space is limited, I shall criticize only one aspect of the book, an aspect which I do not expect other reviewers to deal with.

Walser has the habit, so common in books dealing with any feature of the early Empire, of talking in extremely careless terms about the rhetorical schools. On my second reading of the book I underlined the words "rhetoric," "rhetorical," and "declamatory." In a good many cases it is impossible to determine what he means by the words, unless they are words of loose pejorative meaning, as the word "propaganda" often is in current political discussions. In some cases he plainly means an idea which by implication is divorced from reality and which (again by implication) is current in the rhetorical schools, which (again by implication) deal only with ideas divorced from reality. In no case does "rhetoric" seem to mean the art of persuasive speech. Sometimes it seems to mean a set of ideas applied to a situation, as if we spoke of the rhetoric of senatorial opposition, but of course there is no reason to connect this meaning of the word with the rhetorical schools.

Since Parks' and Bonner's books on the rhetorical schools and the declaimers have shown that the schools and the declaimers were not merely silly people "twittering in a vacuum," it is unfortunate that Walser speaks so loosely. In the case of

Tacitus it seems especially inappropriate, since he did not attend a rhetorical school. There certainly should be room for a certain play of ideas among the educated public of that time, even including a good many rather superficial and erroneous ideas, without our insisting that any idea which seems lacking in accuracy or common sense must have come from the rhetorical schools. It would seem more likely that the senatorial aristocracy developed for itself a certain circle of ideas, partly from reading, partly from the arguments of educated foreigners (who might indeed be rhetors) and partly from its own political situation.

The further development of Walser's work in this book will be more useful if it is sharpened by a more exact idea of the place of the rhetorical schools and a sternly controlled use of the words "rhetoric," "rhetorical," and "declamatory."

RICHARD M. HAYWOOD

*University College
New York University*

A Glossarial Index to De re coquinaria of Apicius. By MARY ELLA MILHAM. (A Set of Five Microcards; UWP-52.) Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, [c] 1952. Pp. vi+211. \$1.50.

Miss Milham has "revised and expanded" (p. iv) her doctoral dissertation, one of the aims of which was to supply "a workable index" (p. iii) to Apicius. This glossarial index is "a combination of glossary to and complete grammatical analysis of the text of Apicius and the related Excerpts from Vinidarius," based on the text of Giarratano and Vollmer (Teubner, 1922).

The method of procedure has been to record the words "under the standard dictionary forms," followed generally by 1) English meaning; 2) reference to or comparison with other related Latin words or spellings of the same word; 3) grammatical analysis with page and line reference to G.V. for each form; and 4) other references. "All manuscript variants and as many editors' variants as possible have

also been recorded, with cross references to the text" (p. iii).

A Key and list of editions are given on pages v and vi, with several deviations from G.V. (p. 4), e.g., in the spelling of names and the dates of publications. The rest of this first card and all of cards 2 to 5 compose pages 1 to 211 of the index proper.

Perhaps it was because of my own faulty vision or imperfections of The Micro Library Reader at the St. Louis Public Library, but I found the reading of these cards a rather arduous experience. After about one hour it became almost impossible to distinguish many letters and numbers; constant adjustment and focusing were necessary. Even under ideal conditions, however, a sentence as brief as *et ipsam aquam pro hydromelli aegris dabis* (G.V., 9, 14f.) will require the use of four cards; this fact alone, plus a reasonable amount of rechecking, will therefore entail repeated changes of cards. Further difficulty is caused by the lack of any indication as to which word (or subdivision of the entry) begins or ends each card and also by a machine which becomes increasingly warmer. For these reasons I have attempted no thorough examination of grammatical analyses, references to G.V., or other references. The eight or ten brief entries which I did check revealed no errors.

In my opinion, the value of this work in its present form will lie principally in the information and source material for the study of Apicius and of Vulgar Latin which it will afford to those interested in only a few entries at a time. (The cards cannot be read by a normal hand-lens, and microcard readers are not as yet widely accessible.) It is hoped that this index and any other such lexicographical work of valuable aid to classical scholarship will be made available in more convenient form for extended use and repeated reference.

FRANK GIVENS PICKEL

Washington University

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XVIII.

Edited with translation and notes by E. LOBEL, C. H. ROBERTS and E. P. WEGENER. London: Egyptian Exploration Society, 1941. Pp. xii+215+1 portrait and 14 plates.

For the first time during the publication of the various *Parts* of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* the name of A. S. Hunt is absent from the title page. In consequence of this the editors thought it fitting that the present *Part* of the series be treated as a sort of memorial volume to him and that a portrait of him be used as a frontispiece. Like most of the preceding instalments the one under review is of composite character, including two theological fragments and numerous literary fragments as well as documents from the Roman and Byzantine periods.

With the exception of No. 2177, the *Acta Alexandrinorum*, the literary fragments are edited by Mr. Lobel. The extreme care taken in an endeavor to present all details regarding each text indicates a labor of love. However, many of the *minutiae* seem superfluous and at times become annoying, especially since one may study the excellent plates at the end of the volume to reach his own conclusions when readings are in doubt. Included in the literary section are fragments of chapter 1 of Galatians, Philo, Aeschylus, Alcaeus, Sappho, Callimachus, Hipponax, *Acta Alexandrinorum*, Sophocles and Plato.

Of the non-literary papyri three deserve special notice. No. 2182 (A.D. 166), a letter from a *strategus* of the Arsinoite nome to the acting *strategus* of the Oxyrhynchite nome, emphasizes the difficulties officials had to face in getting grain on its way to Rome. The writer complains that most of the donkeys requisitioned from the Oxyrhynchite nome for transportation of grain in the Fayûm have disappeared and requests a fresh supply of animals. Appended is a list of the drivers who have run away together with the number of donkeys each had in his charge.

No. 2183 provides further evidence in

support of the view that *strategi* were not normally eligible for office in their own nomes.

No. 2190 is a letter of extraordinary length (64 lines) from a son to his father. The boy expresses relief at his father's forgiveness for certain escapades which included the wrecking of some chariots and states that although he has come to Alexandria to study there is a shortage of good lecturers.

The Byzantine period is represented by two Graeco-Latin letters and three accounts.

VERNE B. SCHUMAN

Indiana University

Gestalten aus Hellas. By MAX POHLENZ.

München: Verlag F. Bruckmann, 1950.

Pp. 744+16 pls. in text. Mk. 25.

The present work, says the author in the Preface, complements his earlier book, *Der hellenische Mensch*, for the essence of a people cannot be fully understood without a picture of its personalities. Accordingly, Pohlenz gives us here a series of essays that go all the way from Hesiod, Sappho, and Solon to "Der hellenistische Mensch" (Callimachus and Theocritus), the Stoa (where Pohlenz, of course, shines), and on to Epictetus and Clement of Alexandria. The central part of the book discusses great figures of the fifth and fourth centuries — dramatists, historians, and philosophers no less than generals and statesmen, such as Themistocles, Pericles, and Alexander. Altogether we have twenty-eight sketches distributed over seventeen chapters, a short bibliography (very much out-of-date because of the war, doubtless), and sixteen portraits (vase painting and sculpture) of uneven choice and quality.

The individual essays rarely pretend to argue points and thus add to the sum of knowledge, nor are they in general original enough to satisfy the specialist seeking momentary refreshment in once familiar fields. Apparently there still exists in Germany a sizeable group of educated

laymen interested in antiquity, and it must be to this audience that Pohlenz speaks. I wonder how many publishers in the United States would be attracted by a manuscript whose idea is to examine such subjects lightly and yet with familiarity and authority. I regret to say, however, that this particular book cannot be heartily recommended to the layman any more than to the specialist.

I can make myself clearer by noticing briefly a typical essay, that on Themistocles. Two-thirds of this essay summarizes Themistocles' life and deeds. The specialist will miss a discussion of the first trial of Miltiades and will regret that Pohlenz has nothing illuminating to say about Athenian politics between Marathon and Salamis. The layman, on the other hand, will sense the curious lack of drama and will not feel that a reference to Phaleron as a modern bathing beach compensates for the omission of Artemisium. The truth is, it is a dull and cursory treatment. The last third of the essay is devoted to an "interpretation" of the man who "not only saved Hellas from slavery but also rescued the entire western culture from Asiatic imperialism and despotism." This part of the essay turns out to be conventional enough, too, despite a startling, if not meaningless, reference to Themistocles' "Führernatur." I leave it to the reader to picture Pohlenz' uncritical enthusiasm for Alexander.

The range of Pohlenz' mind and pen is striking, and I can imagine with what pleasure he has set down the summary results of a lifetime's work. It is extraordinary, however, that a distinguished classicist could write over seven hundred pages and offer so few observations that are at once novel, interesting, and sound.

C. A. ROBINSON, JR.

Brown University

Ancient History. By MICHAEL GRANT.

("Home Study Books.") London: Methuen and Co., 1952. Pp. viii+247+5 maps. 7s. 6d.

Mr. Grant's history deserves more notice than an attempt to cover the whole of ancient history, with some attention to China, India and the Americas, in 247 pages might seem to warrant. His narrative (pp. 44-127) is little more than a sketch of major political developments, but such a compression is justified in the introductory chapter: the most pressing problem of our day is that of political unity so that the general historian should select accordingly and exclude seemingly attractive, but really subsidiary, themes like that of Athenian intellectual development, which would give an incorrect focus. It is rather refreshing to notice that even in this brief account the tendency to federal union in Boeotia and the Chalkidike in the late fifth century B.C. is given equal place with the Peloponnesian War (p. 118). The most provocative element in the book, however, is the devotion of Part II (pp. 128-242) to the causes of ancient wars, justified by the observation that war is the most significant phenomenon in ancient history. Its causes are treated under the headings, "International Anarchy," "Nature and Nationalism," "The Social Structure" and "The Choice of Rulers." They sound very timely — also ephemeral. The writing is vigorous so that disagreement will result as much as agreement. Thus, the book merits a reading by teachers of ancient history as well as by the general audience for which the "Home Study Books" are planned.

CARL ROEBUCK

Northwestern University

Catalogue illustré du Département des Antiquités gréco-romaines au Musée de Damas.
By SÉLIM and ANDRÉE ABDUL-HAK.

("Publications de la Direction Générale des Antiquités de Syrie.") Damas, 1951. Pp. 180+60 pls.+plan.

Since the construction of the splendid new museum at Damascus in 1936 Syrian antiquities dating after 500 B.C. have been installed there, while those of earlier date are to be found in the museum at Aleppo. This sensible arrangement has undoubtedly enhanced the value of both collections. In 1946-47 the antiquities at Damascus were rearranged along geographical lines, further facilitating their study, and the present volume attempts to list and describe the objects as they are now exhibited.

Best known, of course, are the Synagogue of Dura, beautifully reconstructed in a separate wing of the museum, and the rich collection of Palmyrene sculptures. There is much else however that is of interest to students in many fields, not least to students of religion. Unfortunately the catalogue, though to all appearances painstakingly complete, falls short of what could be desired. Many of the illustrations are so poor as to have little or no value. According as the monuments have or have not been adequately published, and as these publications were familiar to the compilers, the information given in the text varies widely in reliability. The Index is inadequate, and there are many misprints. Clearly this is no such work as Cumont's catalogue of the *Cinquantenaire* at Brussels. Yet for all its shortcomings it does help to make the material available, and for this we may be thankful.

FRANCIS R. WALTON

Florida State University

BOOKS RECEIVED

[Not all works submitted can be reviewed, but those that are sent to the editorial office for notice are regularly listed under "Books Received." Offprints from periodicals and parts of books will not be listed unless they are published (sold) separately. Books submitted are not returnable.]

- BAGLIO, GAETANO. *Il Prometeo di Eschilo alla luce delle Storie di Erodoto*. Roma: Angelo Signorelli editore, 1952. Pp. 176. L. 750.
- Boletín del Instituto Marco Fidel Suárez. Año I, Num. 2 (Septiembre-Diciembre, 1951). Medellín, Colombia: Universidad de Antioquia, 1951. Pp. 117 + 302 + 1 map.
- BUSH, DOUGLAS. *Classical Influences in Renaissance Literature*. ("Martin Classical Lectures," Vol. XIII.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (for Oberlin College), 1952. Pp. 10 + 60. \$1.50.
- CAESARE, RAFFAELE DE. *Glosse latine e antiofrancesi all'Alexandreis di Gautier de Châtillon*. ("Pubblicazioni dell' Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore," Vol. XXXIX.) Milano: Società editrice "Vita e Pensiero," 1951. Pp. 160. L. 1500.
- CLARK, KENNETH W. (ed.). *Checklist of Manuscripts in St. Catherine's Monastery, Mount Sinai*. Microfilmed for the Library of Congress, 1950. Washington: Library of Congress, 1952. Pp. xii + 53. \$0.50.
- CORNFORD, F. M. *Principium Sapientiae: The Origins of Greek Philosophical Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952. P. viii + 271. \$5.00.
- DAVID, M. and VAN GRONINGEN, B. A. *Papyrological Primer*. 3rd ed. Leyden: E. J. Brill, 1952. Pp. x + 42 + 178 + 6 facsimiles + 2 maps. Fl. 14.75.
- DIEHL, ERNESTUS † (ed.). *Anthologica Lyrica Graeca*, Fasc. 3: *Iamborum scriptores*. 3rd ed. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1952. Pp. vi + 162. Mk. 5.60.
- DILLER, AUBREY. *The Tradition of the Minor Greek Geographers*. ("Philological Monographs," ed. J. L. Heller, No. 14.) Published by the American Philological Association, 1952. Pp. x + 200 + 1 map + 3 pls. \$5.00. Order through Lancaster Press, Inc., Lancaster, Pa. or B. H. Blackwell, Ltd., Oxford, England.
- Forschungen zur Kunstgeschichte und christlichen Archäologie*, erster Band: *Neue Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte des 1. Jahrtausends*, erster Halbband: *Spätantike und Byzanz*. Baden-Baden: Verlag für Kunst und Wissenschaft, 1952. Pp. 193; 52 figs. in text.
- GURNEY, O. R. *The Hittites*. ("Pelican Books," No. A 259.) London: Penguin Books, 1952. Pp. xvi + 240 + 32 pls.; 19 figs. in text. \$0.85.
- HAMPE, ROLAND. *Die Gleichnisse Homers und die Bildkunst seiner Zeit*. ("Die Gestalt: Abhandlungen zu einer allgemeinen Morphologie," edd. F. K. Schumann, W. Troll, K. L. Wolf, Heft 22.) Tübingen: Max Niemayer Verlag, 1952. Pp. 51 + 23 pls. Mk. 12.
- HANDFORD, S. A. (ed.). *Caesar: Gallic War, Books II and III*. ("Methuen's Classical Texts," ed. Sir Arthur Pickard-Cambridge.) London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1952. Pp. x + 107 (85 without vocab.) + 2 maps + 1 ill. 5s. 6d.; 4s. 6d. without vocab.
- HILL, H. *The Roman Middle Class in the Republican Period*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1952. Pp. xii + 226. \$3.00.
- HØEG, CARSTEN, et ZUNTZ, GUNTHER. *Prophetologium*. ("Union académique internationale, Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae, Lectionaria," edenda curaverunt C. Hoeg, S. Lake, G. Zuntz, Vol. I, Fasc. 3.) Hauniae: Einar Munskskaards Forlag, 1952. Pp. 195-264. Kr. 18.
- HOPE, RICHARD (trans.). *Aristotle's Metaphysics. Newly Translated as a Postscript to Natural Science, with an Analytical Index of Technical Terms*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952. Pp. xvii + 394. \$5.00.
- HUBER, GERHARD. *Platons dialektische Ideenlehre nach dem zweiten Teil des Parmenides*. (Dissertation, Basel, 1950.) Wien: Buchdruckerei Bruna Bartelt, 1951. Pp. 128.
- JÓHANNESSON, ALEXANDER. *Gestural Origin of Language: Evidence from Six "Unrelated" Languages*. Reykjavík: H. F. Leiftur; Oxford, B. H. Blackwell, Ltd., 1952. Pp. 235.
- Klassieke Bibliographie (Bibliographia Classica)*, Vol. 22 (1950). Utrecht: Archaeo-

- logisch Instituut der Rijks-Universiteit te Utrecht, 1950. Pp. 131 + xxix + 31.
- LAMMERT, FR. et BOER, AE. (edd.). *De iudicandi facultate et animi principatu; pseudo-Ptolemaei Fructus sive centiloquium. (Claudii Ptolemaei opera quae exstant omnia, Vol. III 2.)* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1952. Pp. xvi + 120. Mk. 6.
- LEE, H. D. P. (trans.). *Aristotle: Meteorologica*. ("Loeb Classical Library," No. 397.). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952. Pp. xxx + 433 + 10. \$3.00.
- LOB, MARCEL (ed. and trans.). *Cicéron: Discours, Vol. XVIII: Pour Marcellus: Pour Ligarius; Pour le roi Déjotarus*. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1952. Pp. 123 + double pp.
- MARIOTTI, SCEVOLA. *Livio Andronico e la traduzione artistica: Saggio critico ed edizione dei frammenti dell' Odysea*. ("Pubblicazioni dell' università di Urbino," Serie di lettere e filosofia, Vol. I.) Milano: Tipografia Giovanni de Silvestri, 1952. Pp. 115. L. 600.
- MARSHALL, R. T. *Studies in the Political and Socio-Religious Terminology of the De civitate Dei*. ("The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies," Vol. LXXXVI.) Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1952. Pp. 4 + vii + 96. \$1.25.
- MILLS, LAURENS J. (ed. and trans.). *Senilis Amor*. ("Indiana University Publications," Humanities Series, No. 27.) Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1952. Pp. vi + 167. \$2.50.
- MOULINIER, LOUIS. *Le pur et l'impur dans la pensée des Grecs d'Homère à Aristote*. ("Études et Commentaires," Vol. XII.) Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1952. Pp. 449. Fr. 1800.
- NILSSON, MARTIN P. *Opuscula Selecta Linguis Anglica, Francogallica, Germanica Conscripta, Vol. II*. ("Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen," 8^o, II:2.) Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1952. Pp. viii + 457-1083; 6 figs. in text. Kr. 55.
- NUNN, H. P. V. *Christian Inscriptions*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. Pp. 72. \$2.50.
- PRATOR, CLIFFORD H., JR. *Language Teaching in the Philippines: (A Report)*. U. S. Educational Foundation in the Philippines, 1950. Pp. 5 + 96.
- REYNOLDS, J. M. and PERKINS, J. B. WARD (eds.). *The Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*. Rome: Officine Apollon, 1952. Pp. vii + 266 + 11 pls. + 9 maps; 17 figs. in text. 60s. Order from British School at Rome, 1 Lowther Gardens, Exhibition Road, London, S. W. 7.
- ROBINSON, DAVID M. *Excavations at Olynthus, Part XIV: Terracottas, Lamps, and Coins Found in 1934 and 1933*. ("The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology," No. 29.) Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege (Oxford University Press), 1952. Pp. xx + 533 + 174 pls. + frontispiece.
- ROSS, DAVID (ed. and trans.). *The Works of Aristotle*. Translated into English under the Editorship of Sir David Ross. Vol. XII: *Select Fragments*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952. Pp. xii + 162. \$3.00.
- SHERMAN, CHARLES L. (trans.). *Diodorus of Sicily*. In 12 vols. Vol. VII: Books xv. 20-xvi. 65. ("Loeb Classical Library," No. 389.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952. Pp. vi + 431 + 2 maps + 10. \$3.00.
- STRAWSON, P. F. *Introduction to Logical Theory*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.; New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1952. Pp. x + 266. \$3.50.
- TARDITI, GIOVANNI. *I diminutivi nel Satiricon di Petronio*. Genova, 1951. Pp. 23.
- TURYN, ALEXANDER (ed.). *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952. Pp. xvi + 403. \$6.50.
- VOLLGRAFF, W. *L'Oraison funèbre de Gorgias*. ("Philosophia Antiqua: A Series of Monographs on Ancient Philosophy, Vol. IV.") Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1952. Pp. 8 + 175. Fl. 23.
- WALDE, ALOIS, and HOFMANN, J. B. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3d ed. Lieferung 19. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag, 1952. Pp. 593-672. Mk. 4.65.
- WESTLAKE, H. D. *Timoleon and His Relations with Tyrants*. ("Publications of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Manchester," No. 5.) Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1952. Pp. ix + 64. 7s. 6d.
- WINDEKENS, A. J. VAN. *Le Pélasgique: Essai sur une langue indo-européenne préhellénique*. ("Bibliothèque du Muséon," No. 29.) Louvain: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1952. Pp. xii + 179.
- Zbornik filozofske fakultete (Recueil de travaux de la faculté des lettres de Ljubljana)*, Vol. I. ("Univerza v Ljubljani, Filozofska fakulteta.") Ljubljana, 1950. Pp. 176.

in
at
on

m-
nd
he
r-
ns
n-
2.
e.
of
er
l.
on

of
v.
o.
i-
2

ul
;
"

r-
l.
a
-
-

.
)
.

-
.
.
.

g
y
.
y

g
.
.